DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 053 FL 018 971

AUTHOR Lambert, Richard D.
TITLE Language Instruction for Undergraduates in American Higher Education. NFLC Occasional Papers.
INSTITUTION Johns Hopkins Univ., Washington, DC. National Foreign Language Center.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Chinese; College Faculty; Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; Degree Requirements; *Educational Change; French; German; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Japanese; *Language Enrollment; Language Skills; *Language Teachers; Literature Appreciation; Majors (Students); National Surveys; Russian; *Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Spanish; Study Abroad; Teacher Attitudes; Telecommunications; Uncommonly Taught Languages; *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *United States

ABSTRACT

The study of undergraduate language instruction is part of a larger national study of the current status of international studies activities in American colleges and universities. Data are drawn from several annual surveys, analysis of course offerings, a random sampling of transcripts, and general requests for information from college presidents. Survey results are presented in narrative form with tables. The discussion is presented in three parts. The first addresses several very broad features of foreign language instruction, using key national indicators of progress such as enrollments in commonly and uncommonly taught languages, language requirements, and actual course-taking patterns. The second part discusses, and offers a plan of action to address, problems in institutional and national foreign language educational policy apparent from the data, including foreign language study for general education and as skill development, performance norms keyed to length of study, discontinuities in the system, high-achievers, expanded upper-level courses, and study abroad. The third part examines the needs of individual institutions as seen by their foreign language faculty. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
X

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION FOR UNDERGRADUATES IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Richard D. Lambert
National Foreign Language Center

NATIONAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER AT THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
1619 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20036

About the Author

Richard D. Lambert is director of the National Foreign Language Center at The Johns Hopkins University in Washington, D.C., professor emeritus of Sociology and South Asian Regional Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, and editor of *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. He is author of *Points of Leverage: An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies*, *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*, and *The Transformation of an Indian Labor Market: The Case of Pune*. Dr. Lambert's most recent book, *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, is the result of a massive two-year survey of undergraduate international education in the United States, conducted for the American Council on Education.

About the *Occasional Papers*

This is the seventh in a series of *Occasional Papers* published by the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC).

The NFLC prints and distributes as *Occasional Papers* articles on a wide variety of topics related to foreign language research, education, and policy. The papers are read by an internal review committee. The *Occasional Papers* are intended to serve as a vehicle of communication and stimulant for discussion among groups concerned with these topic areas. The views expressed in these papers are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NFLC or of The Johns Hopkins University.

This article is part of a larger work entitled *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, written for the American Council on Education (ACE) by Richard D. Lambert. We wish to thank ACE for granting permission to reprint this chapter in the NFLC Occasional Paper series and for generously providing camera ready copy for our use.

Copies of *International Studies and the Undergraduate* are available in a hardcover edition from the American Council on Education for $17.50 postage-paid (quantity discounts available). All orders must be prepaid by money order or check (made payable to the American Council on Education) and sent to: Publications Department I, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036.

Copyright 1990, The National Foreign Language Center
at The Johns Hopkins University

INTRODUCTION

The following article presents some of the results of a national review of international studies in undergraduate education which has just been published by the American Council on Education.1 In addition to foreign language instruction, that survey covered a fuller range of international studies activities, including study abroad, internationally focused majors and minors, individual courses relating to other countries, and the internationalization of the general campus context. Herein is the section of the report that deals with foreign language instruction.

The data on which the findings are based are as follows:

1. Questions on prior foreign language courses in the ACE/UCLA annual survey of all freshmen entering colleges and universities in the fall of 1986.2

2. Questions on institutions' international education programs and foreign language instruction inserted in ACE's annual Higher Education Panel Report for 1986.3

3. A special mail questionnaire survey of foreign language and international studies in 398 universities, four year and two year colleges in a sample drawn at random from the American Council on Education's nationally representative Higher Education Panel.4

4. Results of site visit interviews and detailed questionnaires filled out by presidents, provosts or deans, and chairs of foreign language departments in a purposive sample of 47 institutions.

5. An analysis of 10,467 internationally-focused course offerings in a subset of 42 institutions.

6. An analysis of 8,439 transcripts comprising a random sample of students graduating in 1986 from 34 institutions in the site visit sample.

7. Responses to a general request for information sent to the presidents of all higher education institutions in the United States.

Data sources 3, 4 and 5 comprise neither random nor strictly representative samples. The institutions were picked to assure representation of different geographic regions, different institutional levels, public vs. private ownership, religious and secular management, and assured the inclusion of both traditionally black institutions and several institutions renowned for their achievements in international studies. Because of the purposive, non-random nature of the selection process, no estimates of statistical error are presented, but it is likely that any bias is upward, that is, the data present an institutional profile in which international studies is slightly more fully represented than in a representative national sample.

Most all of the tables in the report are given by type of institution following a classification adapted from one used by the National Center for Educational Statistics. Universities have a wide variety of doctoral level programs. Comprehensive institutions have strong and diverse graduate programs but a limited number of doctoral programs. Baccalaureate institutions provide

primarily general undergraduate, four-year education. Two-year institutions offer few if any four-year degree programs.

1 Richard D. Lambert, International Studies and the Undergraduate (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1989).
2 Alexander Astin, et al., The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1986 (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, 1986).
3 Elaine El-Khawas, Campus Trends, 1986, Higher Education Panel Report No. 73 (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1986).
4 Charles J. Andersen, International Studies for Undergraduates, 1987: Operations and Opinions, Higher Education Panel Report No. 76 (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1988).

Language Instruction for Undergraduates in American Higher Education

RICHARD D. LAMBERT
National Foreign Language Center

One of the principal challenges facing foreign language instruction on our campuses is to make it fully responsive to changing national needs. At present this relationship is ambiguous and unattended. A second challenge is to consolidate planning for foreign language instruction and international studies. If the purpose of international studies is to teach students about other parts of the world, and if one of the primary purposes of foreign language and literature courses is to introduce students to other cultures, then by all objective standards such instruction is, indeed, a part of international studies. In fact, on many campuses foreign language related courses make up the bulk of internationally oriented instruction.

It is a curious fact that this link between international studies and foreign languages, which to an outsider seems so obvious, is on many campuses not so fully perceived. This is particularly true among the foreign language faculty who, on many campuses, have remarkably little contact or shared interests with other faculty engaged in teaching non-language-oriented courses dealing with other parts of the world. It is also true administratively. Foreign language instruction rarely falls within the responsibilities of international studies administrators; it is left to academic line administrators such as humanities deans. In similar fashion, the numerous planning and developmental activities relating to international studies on campus, except perhaps study abroad activities, only occasionally include foreign languages. When we asked who was taking leadership in promoting international studies, few college administrators mentioned faculty members from the foreign language departments, even when, in fact, such individuals were playing a major role in attempts to internationalize the campus. This divide between international studies and foreign language instruction on many campuses is not surprising from an historical perspective. Foreign language departments were there first, and became fully developed before international studies as such began to appear with its base primarily in the social sciences. But the time has surely come to reconsider this cleavage.

Aside from the question of making this link, there is a broader issue facing the field and higher educational institutions in general. On the campus, foreign language instruction is subject to a set of attitudes ranging from highly critical to neglectful among non-language faculty and administrators, attitudes which led to the curtailment and occasionally even the abolition of language instruction during the 1970's, and which sap its vitality even now. Ultimately, the success of foreign language instruction on campuses critically depends on attitudes toward foreign language learning in the society as a whole, which is, by and large, beyond the control of the language profession itself. It will depend upon our society's recognition of the need to deal with different nationalities in their own tongues. A pressing area of research is the exploration of precisely these attitudes both in the society and on the campus, and what it takes to turn them in a more constructive direction.

The agenda for change in foreign language instruction that will be sketched out below calls for collaborative efforts at all levels and in many different sections of the institution, including but not limited to the foreign language teaching community itself. At this critical juncture in our national discussion about meeting our new international challenge, thinking through a fresh agenda which would be shared by all segments of the world would go a long way toward removing many of the institutional constraints that currently hobble for-

eign language learning on the campus.

Focus and scope of the report. What follows is an explication of what we found in the site interviews, in the substantive data from our won and other national surveys, and in long discussions with many of those both inside and outside the field of foreign language instruction. We do not attempt to examine many of the pedagogical issues that foreign language professionals are legitimately concerned with: for instance, the organization of the major; the improvement of classroom instructional practice; the effectiveness of various testing strategies; materials preparation; teacher training and certification; or the special needs of teachers of particular languages. These are topics which the professional organizations in the field should and do deal with. Moreover, there has been continual improvement on many campuses in the technology of foreign language pedagogy, and the many successes in this domain have accelerated immensely in the past decade. We take this as given.

Rather, the discussion that follows is directed to the structural and functional aspects of foreign language instruction within the broader context of international studies. Our goal is to inform both the institutional and the national planning process. It is our belief that some of the most basic issues in planning for the future of undergraduate foreign language instruction to serve new national needs have to do with the organization and purpose of the enterprise, and it is to these issues that we direct most of our attention.

The discussion that follows is in three parts. First is a discussion of several very broad features of foreign language instruction, with special reference to key national indicators used to measure progress. Second is a discussion and plan for action in addressing a number of the problems raised by national data regarding collegiate foreign language instruction. Third is an examination of the needs of individual institutions as seen by their foreign language faculty.

Skill acquisition and other language courses. As we begin to explore foreign language instruction on our campuses, we will sometimes discuss all aspects of foreign language related instruction, from the first semester in elementary Spanish, for instance, to a course in seventeenth-century French literature. The term we will use in such discussions is "language related courses." We will be paying special attention to those courses more concerned with obtaining skill than with putting those skills to use, that is the elementary, intermediate, and advanced courses in a particular language. Specialized courses such as conversation, composition, and translation, whose purpose also is to provide a student with a capacity to perform in a particular language, will be enumerated as advanced courses, even though very occasionally they may appear earlier in the sequence on some campuses. We will use the term "literature" to refer to focused courses where, while language learning may take palace, the primary purpose of the course is an exposition of a literary topic. Linguistics, while it is included in the language related courses, will be treated separately.

We recognize that in most institutions, particularly the smaller ones, the division between elementary, intermediate, and advanced skill oriented courses and literature courses is not very clear. Skill acquisition courses and literature courses are almost always taught within the same department and are part of the same instructional system—indeed the same faculty members often teach both. We also recognize that the very distinction we draw will irritate many scholars in foreign language studies, since it lies at the heart of one of the principal teleological and structural debates in the field—content versus skill.[1] We treat them separately, not to detach foreign language from its cultural setting, but because the characteristics and the issues surrounding elementary, intermediate, and advanced skill acquisition courses are of a very different order from those addressed in most literature courses. Indeed, in some of the larger institutions, their staffing and management is quite different as well. This discrimination is, of course, particularly indistinct in the upper levels of the skill acquisition sequence.

Our classification was applied on the basis of the course titles and descriptions given in the college and university catalogs, but we bowed to local judgment in our final classification. Where there was any doubt, the chairperson of the relevant department was queried.

Share of language courses in international studies. How important is foreign language instruction in international studies? Table 3.1 indicates the relative share of the two types of foreign language courses among all internationally focused undergraduate courses on the campuses of the four different types of institutions.

To arrive at these figures we reviewed 5,914 language related courses as part of our analysis of a total of 10,467 international studies courses of all kinds. It will

be recalled from the introductory chapter that all of the courses included in our tabulations either had students enrolled in them during the 1985-86 academic year, or were actually taken in the immediate past by students of that institution, as indicated by their appearance on the student transcripts. Hence, "ghost" courses, that is, courses that appear in a catalog but are never actually offered or taken, are not included in the enumeration.

Table 3.1 Skill Oriented and Literature Courses among All Internationally Oriented Courses

Type of International Course	Percentage of International Courses[a] Credited at—				
	University (N = 4,277)	Comprehensive (N = 1,964)	Baccalaureate (N = 3,802)	Two-year (N = 424)	Total (N = 10,467)
All international courses	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Language related courses	52.7	44.9	42.4	59.2	56.5
Skill oriented courses	31.8	26.9	19.8	50.0	45.9
Literature courses	20.9	18.0	22.6	9.2	20.5

Sources: Catalog course listings and transcript analysis.

Note: N = number of international courses. Data came from 42 institutions including 13 universities, 10 comprehensive institutions, 13 baccalaureate colleges, and 6 two-year institutions.

[a] Courses taken either in 1985-86 or in the recent past, as recorded on transcripts of recent degree recipients.

It can be seen that foreign language related courses comprise about half of all the internationally oriented courses offered by institutions. Small wonder that many college administrators think of foreign language courses as coterminous with international studies: it is where a very large part of their internationally oriented institutional resources are invested. Historically, it is where international studies started, and to this day, language related courses make up a very substantial portion of the international education of many students. Indeed, in many cases they are the only internationally oriented courses taken by many students.

In reading table 3.1, care should be taken not to read equivalences in percentages as equivalences in absolute amounts. For instance, while the proportion of foreign language related courses among all internationally oriented courses is higher in the community colleges (59.2 percent) than in the other institutional classes, the absolute number of language related courses offered by the average community college in our sample was only 41, of which 35, or 85.4 percent, were skill acquisition courses. Since foreign literature courses tend to be upper division courses, and generally require some prior exposure to college level foreign language instruction, such courses are rarely offered by the institution or taken by the students. In the community colleges, as we will note below, one of the major national challenges is the meaningful extension of foreign language instruction.

At the baccalaureate institutions, where each institution offered an average of 124 language related courses, less than half (46.8 percent) were skill oriented courses. It is among the liberal arts colleges that literature courses are the principal vehicle for foreign language related instruction. Universities and comprehensive institutions fall between the extremes represented by community colleges and baccalaureate institutions. Table 3.2 makes it possible to make these comparisons directly. It presents the same data as contained in table 3.1, expressed in terms of the *scale* of the programs, that is, the mean number of courses per institution in each category, and the share of skill oriented courses in the overall language related course offerings.

Function of foreign languages in international studies. These two tables make it clear why, even if the substantive arguments for the importance of foreign language learning to international studies were not convincing enough, any plans for the improvement of international studies as a whole must be centrally concerned with foreign language teaching.

Table 3.2 Mean Number of Language Related Courses per Institution, by Course and Institutional Type

Type of Course	Mean Number of Courses at—				
	University	Comprehensive	Baccalaureate	Two-year	Total
All language related courses	170	87	119	41	116
Literature courses	65	34	61	6	48
Skill oriented courses	105	53	58	35	68
Skill oriented courses as a percentage of all language related courses	61.8%	60.9%	48.7%	85.4%	58.6%

Source: Catalog course listings and transcript analysis.

The current allocation of internationally oriented courses—and by extension faculty time—among foreign languages and other disciplinary courses and among different types of foreign language courses is the result of historic accumulation, not specific planning. The dedication of such a large proportion of international studies to foreign language related courses is one of the major policy issues facing the nation, and individual institutions as well. The question is whether this is the optimal use of resources or whether some other allocation of resources is more appropriate. This is no simple matter. Hidden in this consideration are two opposing arguments we heard on many campuses about the purposes of foreign language instruction at the collegiate level. One argument held that skill oriented language instruction belonged at the secondary school level—at the college level foreign language skills should be assumed and utilized in substantive courses. From this argument, one would attempt to curtail skill oriented language courses and expand substantive courses utilizing language skills, extending them as far as possible to disciplines other than the study of literature. The other argued that language departments had become too literature oriented and that too few students received too little skill oriented foreign language instruction. From this argument, resources should be shifted from literature courses into skill oriented language instruction. This debate was hidden in many of the discussions we heard among administrators and language faculty on many campuses, and it needs to be addressed directly, both on individual campuses and nationally. To address this question, we will have to discuss some of the purposes of foreign language instruction and to relate foreign language learning to the other parts of the international studies curriculum, points we shall address later.

Enrollments

Planning for national as well as institutional foreign language education is severely limited by the kinds of data that are generally available for consideration. Currently, records are kept on two gross features of foreign language education: total enrollments in foreign language courses, and the number of institutions or states that require foreign language study. As we shall see, neither of them is as fully informative as is necessary for effective institutional or national planning.

Total foreign language enrollments. The most comprehensive data available on foreign language enrollments across the nation are collected by the Modern Language Association of America (MLA), which has

Table 3.3 Mean Enrollment at Sample Institutions, by Language and Institutional Type, 1983 and 1986

	University		Comprehensive		Baccalaureate		Two-year	
Language / Year	Mean Enrollment	(Number of Institutions)	Mean Enrollment	(Number of Institutions)	Mean Enrollment	(Number of Institutions)	Mean Enrollment	(Number of Institutions)
Arabic								
1983	36	(10)	89	(1)	—	—	20	(1)
1986	27	(11)	43	(1)	4	(3)	—	—
Chinese								
1983	106	(12)	52	(3)	24	(8)	74	(2)
1986	95	(13)	57	(5)	33	(8)	83	(1)
French								
1983	986	(15)	292	(9)	170	(13)	460	(6)
1986	852	(16)	223	(10)	173	(13)	328	(6)
German								
1983	458	(16)	130	(10)	90	(12)	143	(5)
1986	404	(16)	86	(11)	81	(12)	126	(5)
Italian								
1983	161	(13)	118	(3)	30	(5)	96	(5)
1986	170	(14)	70	(3)	23	(6)	113	(5)
Japanese								
1983	117	(13)	76	(4)	21	(8)	422*	(2)
1986	130	(14)	79	(5)	32	(9)	296*	(3)
Portuguese								
1983	45	(11)	11	(1)	—	—	—	—
1986	65	(12)	—	—	1	(1)	30	(1)
Russian								
1983	144	(16)	89	(5)	65	(9)	17	(2)
1986	157	(15)	86	(5)	62	(8)	92	(1)
Spanish								
1983	1,081	(16)	294	(9)	122	(13)	975	(6)
1986	1,148	(16)	263	(10)	127	(13)	738	(7)

Source: MLA enrollment surveys.

Note: Figures in parentheses represent the number of institutions on which the mean is based for each language for each institutional type for each year.

— No enrollment reported.

* Two-year institution enrollments in Japanese are swamped by enrollments in Hawaii Community College system and would not be representative of all such institutions.

made a major contribution to the topic by maintaining a relatively consistent record of overall national trends over the years. Their data aggregate reports from college and university registrars, and give the total enrollments of undergraduates in each foreign language and the total numbers of students enrolled in foreign language courses. The data are taken by many as a barometer of the demand for foreign language instruction and, by derivation, the well-being of the field. At the national level, most language teachers are heartened by reports from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages that secondary school enrollments increased by ten percent between 1982 and 1985, and the MLA's report that, after a steady decline in the 1970s and 1980s, there has been a 3.9 percent increase in collegiate foreign language registrations between the fall term of 1983 and the fall term of 1986.[2] In 1986 college level foreign language enrollments broke the million mark for the first time in fourteen years; they have gone up two trienniums in a row, and increases have been noted in every major modern language except German, Arabic, and Hebrew.

What is true at the aggregate national level, however, is not universally true of individual institutions. Even at the national level, foreign language enrollments declined by 0.9 percent among two-year colleges. Beyond this, when we reviewed some further calculations from the 1983 and 1986 MLA enumerations, the picture was much more mixed.

Table 3.4 Language Enrollment and Program Changes, by Institutional Type, 1983 to 1986

Institutional Type	No. of Programs with Enrollees 1986	Enrollment		Institutions That Reported			Number of Programs That, Since 1983, Were	
		1986	Percent Change from 1983	Increase in Enrollment	No Change	Decrease in Enrollment	Added	Dropped
Arabic								
University	11	291	−18%	2		8	1	
Comprehensive	1	43	−52			1		
Baccalaureate	3	11	*				3	
Two-year	0	0	*					1
Chinese								
University	13	1,229	+3	7		5	1	
Comprehensive	5	283	+80	3			2	
Baccalaureate	8	262	+39	3	2	2	1	1
Two-year	1	83	−44				1	2
French								
University	16	13,634	−14	6		10		
Comprehensive	10	2,225	−25	2	1	6	1	
Baccalaureate	13	2,248	+1	6	1	6		
Two-year	6	1,965	−29	1		5		
German								
University	16	6,464	−12	6		10		
Comprehensive	11	948	−28	2		8	1	
Baccalaureate	12	967	−10	3		9		
Two-year	5	631	−12	2		3		
Italian								
University	14	2,367	−14	8		5	1	
Comprehensive	3	210	−41	1		2		
Baccalaureate	6	136	−9	2		3	1	
Two-year	5	566	+17	3		2		
Japanese								
University	14	1,813	+20	7		6	1	
Comprehensive	5	394	+30	3		1	1	
Baccalaureate	9	290	+73	8			1	
Two-year	3	889	+5	1			2	1

Table 3.3 presents our own tabulation of the MLA data on total language enrollments for the 16 universities, 11 comprehensive institutions, 13 baccalaureate institutions, and 7 community colleges in our sample. They represent the mean total enrollment in each language per college or university of each institutional type. It should be remembered that our sample institutions were not selected to be fully representative of all institutions in their class. However, to check whether the conclusions reached on the basis of our sample were more widely representative, we analyzed the MLA's data on all of the institutions in five states—Ohio, North Carolina, California, Texas, and Massachusetts—and the same overall pattern emerges of mixed increases and decreases. Using our own sample, however, allows us to be a little more specific about the nature of the changes that have taken place in the different types of institutions.

What our data indicate is that

Table 3.4 Language Enrollment and Program Changes, by Institutional Type, 1983 to 1986 (continued)

Institutional Type	No. of Programs with Enrollees 1986	Enrollment		Institutions That Reported			Number of Programs That, Since 1983, Were	
		1986	Percent Change from 1983	Increase in Enrollment	No Change	Decrease in Enrollment	Added	Dropped
				Portuguese				
University	12	781	+57	6		5	1	
Comprehensive	0	0	[a]					1
Baccalaureate	1	1	[a]				1	
Two-year	1	30	[a]				1	
				Russian				
University	15	2,361	−2	8		7		1
Comprehensive	5	432	−3	3		2		1
Baccalaureate	8	492	−16	2	1	5		1
Two-year	1	92	+171[c]	1				1
				Spanish				
University	16	18,360	+6	8	1	7		
Comprehensive	10	2,629	−1	4		5	1	
Baccalaureate	13	1,647	+4	7	1	5		
Two-year	7	5,164	−12	2		4	1	

Source: MLA enrollment survey data for sample institutions.

[a] No enrollment in 1983.

[b] No enrollment in 1986.

[c] Enrollment decline at one institution from 15 to 0 and an increase in one program from 19 to 92.

within the national level figures showing overall change in enrollments, there is an immense amount of variation by institutional type. Declines in mean enrollment are interspersed with increases in most of the languages and institutional categories.

To demonstrate this mixed pattern of change a little more clearly, table 3.4 shows rates of change between 1983 and 1986 by institutional type and by language. The figures in the first column indicate the number of institutions that reported to the MLA that there were enrollments in courses in the indicated language in the fall of 1986; not all institutions reported enrollments in all languages. To given some idea of scale, the second column indicates the total enrollments for that language in all institutions of that type. It is the remaining columns that present the interesting refinement of the national level data. The third column indicates the percent change in total enrollments in that institutional type between 1983 and 1986. The next three columns indicate the number of institutions that reported an increase in enrollments, steady state, or a decline in enrollments, respectively. The final two columns indicate the number of language programs that seem to have been initiated or dropped between 1983 and 1986.

Reports on overall national trends inevitably mask considerable local variation. It is therefore not surprising that a somewhat different picture of trends in language enrollments emerges from these two tables. The general increase indicated by the reports on national trends turns out not to be characteristic of all or even most institutions or institutional types. It is possible that the differences between reported national trends and the trends shown in table 3.4 are the result of either errors in reporting enrollments to the MLA in either year, or the nonrepresentativeness of our sample. However, the number of minuses in column 3 indicating a negative change (18 out of 36) and, in column 6, the number of programs in the sample (132) showing a decline of enrollments between 1983 and 1986, and the number of institutions where enrollments were reported in 1983 but not in 1986 (10) would indicate that enrollment declines occurred on many campuses.

To emphasize this point a little further, and to guard against possible bias in our sampling, we calculated from the MLA data gains and losses in individual language enrollments in all university, comprehensive, and baccalaureate institutions in two states—Ohio and North Carolina. We selected these states because they are known to have a substantial number of institutions in each of the three institutional categories. These two tabulations are not strictly comparable. For instance, our tabulations from the sample included community colleges; tabulations from the MLA data did not. However, the fundamental point of immense institutional variation hidden under national aggregate data emerges from both tabulations. The Ohio and North Carolina tabulations showed 198 cases of increase in language specific enrollments and 122 declines. Quick calculations from MLA data for California, Texas, and Massachusetts showed similar variation in patterns of growth and decline.[3]

Aside from this contrast with the national averages, what changes in foreign language enrollments do these data suggest? First, in the sample data, except for Japanese, the less commonly taught languages seem to be declining in enrollments almost everywhere. The data are more variable in Ohio and North Carolina tabulations. Japanese seems to be expanding everywhere in both the sample and the state data, whereas the progress of Chinese is variable among the sample institutions, but state data in Ohio and North Carolina show increased enrollments in ten institutions an declines in two. The study of Arabic seems to be consistently reduced in the sample institutions, even though a few new programs are being added, and it breaks even in terms of growth and decline rates in the state data. Russian seems to be drifting downward, although not precipitously, in the sample data. As many institutions in our sample gained enrollments in Russian as lost, but except for one community college, in all institutional types there is a net enrollment decline in Russian, and individual programs are disappearing. The state data show an increase in 16 of 23 institutions. This immense variability among institutions and this frequent decline in enrollments is surely ironic when the national need for competency in Russian—if only to monitor compliance with the new arms agreements—is suddenly growing, and there are too few qualified Russian speakers to fill the need.

The most interesting data are those relating to the most commonly taught languages—Spanish, French, and German. The MLA's report of the decline in German is reflected in the data on the sample institutions, and 36 out of 66 institutions show a decline in the Ohio and California data. North Carolina shows an aggregate increase of 9 percent in overall enrollments in German, while Ohio shows an overall enrollment decrease of 12 percent. Like German, enrollment changes in French are also variable. In our sample data, French lost enrollments in every institutional category except baccalaureate institutions, where it is almost constant, and 27 institutions have shown a decline compared with 15 showing an increase. In the state data, 52 out of 79 institutions show an increase. Ohio shows a 2 percent decrease in overall enrollments in French, while North Carolina shows a 17 percent increase. Spanish appears to be fairly stable, but it is certainly not undergoing the major expansion that our emerging multicultural society calls for. In the state data, 35 out of 90 institutions actually show a decline in enrollments. The overall impression gained from the sample and the state data is one of a highly varied pattern of growth and decline in overall enrollments among the different institutions and languages. The basic point is clear: institutional, state, and national planning must consider variations in the direction and rate of change in specific institutions and institutional types, along with the national aggregate data.

Aside from variability, we should also note that the continuing overwhelming dominance of enrollments in the commonly taught languages is still largely untouched. Enrollments in French, German, and Spanish still predominate (56,882 in our sample in those languages compared with 13,096 in the other languages;

Table 3.5 Mean First Semester Enrollments in Language Courses at Sample Institutions, by Level of Course, Language, and Institutional Type, Academic Year 1985–86

Language / Course Level	Mean First Semester Enrollment at—			
	University	Comprehensive	Baccalaureate	Two-year
Chinese				
Elementary	78	50	20	112[a]
Intermediate	51	48	9	36
Advanced	47	20	4	—
French				
Elementary	508	150	65	361
Intermediate	230	51	62	60
Advanced	169	120	21	10
German				
Elementary	275	64	50	99
Intermediate	88	31	30	27
Advanced	91	47	10	8
Japanese				
Elementary	97	77	38	601[a]
Intermediate	41	24	9	35
Advanced	69[b]	7	9	9
Russian				
Elementary	79	35	16	42
Intermediate	31	21	20	—
Advanced	61	38	17	—
Spanish				
Elementary	886	269	76	788
Intermediate	322	55	44	221
Advanced	212	78	16	64

Source: Registrar reports from sample institutions.

— No enrollment.

[a] Large average enrollment results from the inclusion of the University of Hawaii Community College System.

[b] Large average enrollment results from the inclusion of Brigham Young University.

50,575 compared to 7,049 in the state data), but the preponderance is not quite so great as is usually thought. The inclusion of the smaller enrollment languages would increase total enrollments in the less commonly taught languages, but not by much.

Enrollment gradients by level of instruction. In addition to indicating the variation in enrollment gains and declines by institution and institutional type, the other major change in record keeping that would assist both national and institutional planning is to report enrollments by course level. Changes in total foreign language enrollments tell us a little, but not very much, about what is happening in foreign language instruction either nationally or within a particular institution. As we will see, this gives a much more accurate picture of the nature of foreign language instruction on the campus.

Table 3.5 presents data provided on fall 1985 undergraduate enrollments in various levels and kinds of language instruction in 25 of the sample institutions. They comprise tabulations of the enrollments in courses in each language by level. To dramatize the importance of looking at enrollment gradients rather than total enrollment, consider the case of two hypothetical institutions, each with 1,000 total enrollments in foreign language classes. In one case, all of the 1,000 are in the first semester with no students going on to a higher level; in the other the students are evenly distributed across the levels. The functioning of their language teaching programs is obviously quite different.

These data begin to make clear that much of the instructional effort in colleges and universities is devoted to elementary, or at most intermediate, level foreign language instruction.

Table 3.6 gives a more detailed view of the enrollment attrition rate from one level to another in the elementary, intermediate, and advanced courses in each language. These data show the attrition between the first and the second semester, between the first and the second year, and between the second and third year and beyond. The figures in the body of the table display these enrollment gradients in the form of a percent change in enrollments from one class level to the next. For instance, in 11 universities in our sample, enrollments in elementary French in the first term were 6,095 and in the second term 3,855; the

Table 3.6 Comparison of Language Enrollments, by Class Level, Language, and Institutional Type, Academic Year 1985–86

Institutional Type	Percentage Difference in Enrollment[a] from— 1st to 2nd Term	1st to 2nd Year	2nd to 3rd Year
		Chinese	
University	−31.4%	−32.4%	−60.7%
Comprehensive	−16.8	−52.4	−84.6
Baccalaureate	−5.9	−81.5	−91.1
Two-year	−70.4	−71.6	na
		French	
University	−36.8	−52.9	−64.2
Comprehensive	−38.0	−62.1	−65.5
Baccalaureate	−21.0	−2.2	−87.0
Two-year	−58.6	−81.8	na
		German	
University	−38.6	−57.8	−66.2
Comprehensive	−21.0	−54.7	−65.9
Baccalaureate	−34.1	−49.2	−78.9
Two-year	−52.6	−86.6	−94.1
		Japanese	
University	−56.0	−51.5	−43.1
Comprehensive	−15.6	−75.8	−95.1
Baccalaureate	−43.1	−81.7	−73.8
Two-year	−77.5	−94.0	−89.8
		Russian	
University	−46.6	−56.0	−35.6
Comprehensive	−6.8	−33.6	−49.8
Baccalaureate	−8.1	−9.1	−59.5
Two-year	−46.0	na	na
		Spanish	
University	−43.2	−58.9	−60.0
Comprehensive	−55.6	−75.0	−60.1
Baccalaureate	−23.1	−52.0	−83.9
Two-year	−74.2	−70.4	−93.8

Source: Registrar reports from 25 institutions.

na Not applicable.

[a] Total enrollments at 25 sample institutions. Data for the three institutions on the quarter system were converted to 2nd semester equivalents by averaging the enrollments for the 2nd and 3rd quarters.

difference in enrollments was 2,240, a decline of 36.8 percent.

This attrition in enrollments is well known to language department chairs. As part of our site visits, we asked 64 departmental chairpersons for their estimates of the percent of students at one level who proceeded to the next. Their estimates are not too far off the actual averages. The mean estimate by chairpersons was that 71.3 percent of students enrolled in the first term continued on into the second term, 49.4 percent went from the first year to the second, and 26.0 percent went from the second year to the third.

Steep enrollment gradients reflect the limited amount of training that students get in particular languages. Table 3.7 indicates for each of the six languages covered in table 3.5 the percent of those students who stop at the elementary, intermediate, or advanced level.

Table 3.7 Percentage Distribution of Language Students, by Highest Level Taken, Language, and Institutional Type

Language Course Level	Percentage of Language Students in—			
	University	Comprehensive	Baccalaureate	Two-year
Chinese				
Elementary	48.2%	52.9%	45.5%	60.0%
Intermediate	29.6	23.5	20.5	40.0
Advanced	22.2	23.5	34.1	—
French				
Elementary	46.3	58.9	40.0	73.2
Intermediate	41.9	22.2	39.0	23.2
Advanced	11.8	18.9	21.0	3.6
German				
Elementary	55.2	56.9	45.3	76.5
Intermediate	34.4	17.0	31.4	23.5
Advanced	10.4	26.1	23.3	—
Japanese				
Elementary	42.6	80.0	45.9	100.0
Intermediate	23.4	15.6	29.4	—
Advanced	34.0	4.4	24.7	—
Russian				
Elementary	43.6	27.5	53.5	100.0
Intermediate	30.8	37.5	26.7	—
Advanced	25.6	35.0	19.8	—
Spanish				
Elementary	45.3	75.4	52.6	56.2
Intermediate	44.6	18.9	32.7	42.3
Advanced	10.2	5.7	14.7	1.5

Source: Transcript analysis.

— No students with course credits at this level.

Steep enrollment gradients have important consequences for a department's teaching program. They mean that language departments must devote most of their instruction time to beginners, and in schools where there is a language requirement, they must often spend a substantial amount of their time and effort on reluctant beginners. Low completion rates by individual students are extremely frustrating for teachers who well know that to attain even an elementary command of a language demands several years of effort. The most demoralizing situation for teachers must be when the bulk of the students take only a semester of a language, and where an institution's practice translates a one-year foreign language requirement into a semester in each of two languages. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to escape a sense of futility. In many universities, professorial morale is preserved by assigning T.A.'s to the low-level, high-turnover classes. In smaller institutions it is done by compartmentalizing instruction into term or year units so that the continuity of instruction for individual students is not a major issue for the individual instructor.

In closing this section, the most general point we want to stress is that in taking enrollment figures as guides to structural change, planning must distinguish among the different languages, the levels of instruction, and institutional contexts.

Language Requirements

As in the case of total foreign language enrollments, we believe that requirements for admission or graduation are too gross a measure of foreign language instruction to serve as a base for national, state, or institutional planning. Currently, however, many in the foreign language field take the expansion or contraction of foreign language requirements as a barometer of the well-being of the field. The spread of requirements, like growing total enrollments, is taken as an indication of increasing national demand for foreign language instruction. In the case of requirements, of course, we are speaking of institutional demand, since the whole point of requirements is to substitute faculty prescription for freely expressed student demand. Language requirements comprise an institutional statement on how many and what kinds of students should be required to take how much foreign language education.

Table 3.8 Percentage of Institutions with Foreign Language Requirements, by Institutional Type, 1987

Language Requirements	University (N = 161)	Comprehensive (N = 408)	Baccalaureate (N = 739)	Two-year (N = 1,311)
For admission				
All students	22%	13%	11%	1%
Some students	14	1	1	1
For graduation				
All students	9	8	22	<1
Some students	68	70	40	13

Source: Special HEP survey, No. 76.

The most extreme answers are: "everybody" and "nobody." Not many institutions we studied take the latter position to the extent of not offering foreign language courses at all. However, we did not cover the technical specialty schools in either our site visits or special HEP survey, although presumably many of them offer foreign language training.[4]

We did encounter some private musings among academic administrators and nonlanguage faculty who leaned toward the "nobody" answer. Some wonder whether lower level, skill oriented language instruction qualifies as college level education, since other elementary "skill" courses such as algebra and arithmetic do not. They argue that foreign language instruction should be given to students before they enter college, or that it should be the students' responsibility to acquire a foreign language competency on his or her own as in individual, extracurricular activity. We did encounter one experimenting liberal arts college in our sample that adopted just such a philosophy and offered no foreign language instruction of its own, although it arranged for students to acquire foreign language competencies at nearby institutions if they wished.

A variant on the argument that foreign language instruction is not a scholarly pursuit is the frequently reiterated position of the National Endowment for the Humanities: it holds that while the study of literature is a fitting scholarly pursuit, acquiring foreign language skills to read that literature is mere skill acquisition, not one of the humanities.

There are few language "Luddites" ready to dismantle the entire foreign language instructional apparatus. The debate is usually not about whether foreign language courses should be offered for academic credit at all, but about whether some or all students should be required to take them, and if so who and how much.

The opposite point of view is taken by those who answer that everybody should take a foreign language. This usually implies a universal foreign language requirement either for admission or graduation, or both. As we will see, the more extreme position is less common—most institutions specify foreign language requirements at graduation for specifically designated students and assume that the college will have to provide the instruction, not the secondary schools. How many institutions took the "everybody" alternative and how many the "some" option and at what level? Table 3.8 indicates the percentage of institutions in our national HEP sample that required all or some entering students to have had foreign language training in high school, and the percentage of institutions that required all or some students to take foreign language courses for graduation.[5]

The "everybody" response is infrequently given either as an entrance or graduation requirement. The great majority of four-year institutions (84 percent) and of two-year institutions (97 percent) have no foreign language requirements for entrance. Where there is a foreign language requirement for admission it usually specifies two years of high school classroom instruction. None of the four-year institutions actually required entering students to demonstrate a minimal level of foreign language competency through an examination; total "seat time" is enough.

Foreign language requirements for graduation are more common. However, except for baccalaureate institutions, where the student body is often more homogeneous and more liberal arts oriented, relatively few institutions require all of their students to have studied a foreign language before graduation. Data from the special HEP survey indicate that 31 percent of four-year institutions and 86 percent of two-year institutions have no foreign language graduation requirements for any students, but 69 percent of the four-year institutions and 14 percent of the two-year institutions have foreign language requirements for some or all of their students. Among the four-year institutions with foreign language graduation requirements for all students, 39 percent specify a minimum of one or two semesters of study. While there are a few institutions that require a minimal

level of performance on an independent language competency test, such a requirement is still uncommon. None of the institutions in the HEP sample with a universal language requirement does more than specify "seat time."

When, as is usually the case, foreign language requirements apply to only some students, who are they, and what requirements apply?

As might be expected, it is the liberal arts majors (particularly the humanists, and to a lesser extent the social scientists) to whom foreign language requirements tend to apply and of whom more language study is expected. The preprofessional fields are touched only lightly. And in almost all cases, the requirement is given in number of semesters or years of classroom study, not a demonstrated foreign language competency.

One of the primary implications of these data is that if the expansion of language requirements among institutions is to be taken as an index of the expansion or contraction of national interest in foreign languages, we need more information as to the target population and the nature of the requirement.

We have no interest in entering into the debate about foreign language requirements. The issues have been argued again and again on most campuses in the country and in national reports on undergraduate educational reform. Like so many long-lived academic controversies, it thrives on dilemmas, becomes encrusted with symbolism, and has major organizational as well as intellectual implications. Even among the highly selective liberal arts colleges in our site visit sample, about half have neither admission nor graduation foreign language requirements, and most others have only graduation requirements. While they all support the importance of foreign language learning, the ones that do not require a specified number of courses either object to or try to minimize requirements of any kind, or dislike the structural and pedagogical implications of attempting to teach foreign languages to substantial numbers of unenthusiastic students.

One of the best summaries of the issues in the language requirement debate was contained in a report of a curricular committee at Swarthmore College which wrestled with the question for many months. While it wound up recommending the installation of a requirement, the faculty was determined to avoid the damaging consequences of such a decision for its foreign language departments. The following excepts from that report indicates the nature of its concern:

> Some of the six members of the Department of Foreign Languages with whom CEP [Committee on Educational Policy] consulted were quick to point out that a college-wide graduation requirement would almost certainly entail significant curricular and staffing adjustments. For example, the immediate increase in language teaching would correspondingly reduce the number of literary offerings now available unless compensatory staffing were provided. Furthermore, it would be necessary to add non-intensive sections in all languages to accommodate less dedicated, perhaps even reluctant, students merely working to satisfy a requirement.[6]

Swarthmore's solution, following one developed at Stanford, was to push the responsibility for foreign language education back on the high schools. They noted that 67 percent of their students arrived on campus with four years of instruction in a single foreign language in high school, and 89 percent had had at least three years of such instruction. They set their requirement at three years, including study undertaken in high school. They allowed students to certify the equivalent through a score on a nationally normed test, and they provided a year's language study on campus if neither of

Table 3.9 Percentage of Institutions with Language Requirements for Some Baccalaureates, by Broad Discipline Groups and Institutional Type, 1987

Discipline Group	University (N = 110)	Comprehensive (N = 284)	Baccalaureate (N = 295)	Two-year (N = 689)
Humanities	89%	86%	95%	91%
Social sciences	92	70	69	73
Natural sciences	66	49	45	50
Education	20	20	14	17
Computer science	42	30	26	30
Business (undergraduate)	18	12	32	22
Engineering	8	11	5	8
Health sciences	23	15	3	11

Source: Special HEP survey, No. 76.

Note: Table shows the percentages of only those institutions that had a language requirement for some, but not all, of their baccalaureates.

Table 3.10 Percentage of Four-year Institutions with Language Requirements for Some Students, by Length of Study and Discipline Group, 1987

Discipline Group	Percentage of Institutions Requiring— One or Two Semester Equivalents	Three or More Semester Equivalents
Humanities	33%	57%
Social sciences	32	41
Natural sciences	26	24
Education	9	8
Computer science	17	13
Business (undergraduate)	13	9
Engineering	5	3
Health sciences	5	6

Source: Special HEP survey, No. 76.

Note: Table shows the percentages of only those institutions that had a language requirement for some, but not all, of their baccalaureates.

the two alternatives sufficed. A very highly selective school like Swarthmore, with the superior scholastic achievements and liberal arts orientation of its student body, can reach such a decision and not reduce very much their students' exposure to foreign language study. Other institutions may not be able to make this assumption, although in the fall of 1986, 71.1 percent of all freshman entering institutions of higher education indicated that they had already had two years or more of foreign language education, up from 65.5 percent in the fall of 1985.[7]

While Swarthmore was able to set a general requirement and put most of the responsibility for meeting that requirement on secondary schools or the student, as tables 3.9 and 3.10 show, many institutions opt for requiring a substantial period of language study on campus. Foreign language departments see themselves as facing a cruel dilemma. On the one hand, they know all too well the corruption of the teaching process that results from filling classes with students who are there not of their own free will. On the other hand, many language departments are strongly convinced of the value of foreign language learning, recognize that it requires dedicated hard work on the part of the learner and that it cannot be accomplished in the brief time that many learners volunteer to devote to it, and see the language requirement as a means to guarantee that as many students as possible will get some significant exposure.

It is a rare institution, however, that measures the effectiveness of a foreign language requirement against the language courses that students actually take. Swarthmore did so, and found that the imposition of their language requirement made almost no difference in the actual pattern of course taking. we believe that the real issue is not requirements, but what students actually get.

Actual Course-Taking Patterns

Language requirements are at best curricular prescriptions, and students, particularly college students, are notoriously inventive in corrupting or avoiding requirements they do not care for. As a case in point, some years ago at a major Ivy League university, the faculty institute a four credit pass/fail system in the hope of encouraging students to broaden their educational sampling by enrolling in such reportedly difficult courses as physics, biology, or economics without damaging their grade point averages. A few years later, it was discovered that three-fourths of the pass/fail options were being used to meet the foreign language requirement.

The fundamental question, one which is essential to national, state, and institutional planning, one that should

Table 3.11 Percentage Distribution of Degree Recipients by Highest Level of Skill Oriented Language Course Taken and Institutional Type, 1986

Course Level	Percentage of Degree Recipients at— University (N = 1,915)	Comprehensive (N = 2,475)	Baccalaureate (N = 2,950)	Two-year (N = 1,099)
No language courses taken	46.1%	61.5%	39.8%	72.8%
Some skill oriented language courses taken	53.9	38.5	60.2	27.2
Highest course level				
Elementary	*43.3*	*62.7*	*42.1*	*60.5*
Intermediate	*43.0*	*20.8*	*37.9*	*37.5*
Advanced	*13.7*	*16.5*	*20.0*	*2.0*

Source: Transcript analysis.

Note: N = the number of graduates whose transcripts were examined. Figures in italics show the distribution of only those students who took at least one skill oriented language course, by the highest level of course taken. The number of students taking such courses were: 1,033 at universities, 953 at comprehensive institutions, 1,776 at baccalaureate colleges, and 299 at two-year colleges.

precede any debates about what should be offered and what should be required in foreign language education, is: How many students of what kind take how much foreign language training in what languages? Table 3.11 is based on our analysis of the transcripts of 8,439 students graduating in 1986 from 34 colleges and universities. The figures indicate the percentage of students in the different types of institutions whose highest level skill oriented course in any language was at the elementary, intermediate, or advanced level. (It will be recalled that literature courses are omitted from this enumeration. We will discuss later the proportion of students who take such courses.)

Table 3.12 Mean Number of Language Courses Taken by 1986 Degree Recipients, by College Major and Institutional Type

Major	University	Comprehensive	Baccalaureate	Two-year
Humanities				
Archaeology	2.0	0.0	—	0.0
Art	1.2	1.7	1.7	0.6
Drama	1.6	1.8	2.2	1.0
History	2.8	1.1	2.4	1.5
Language and literature	5.3	3.0	2.9	3.6
Linguistics	7.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
Music	0.9	1.0	2.4	—
Philosophy	3.4	1.3	2.2	4.0
Religion	3.0	1.3	2.8	0.0
Other humanities	1.2	0.9	2.3	0.9

The first thing to be noted is that a substantial portion of the undergraduate student body in each institutional type received no skill oriented language instruction. When all of the samples from all of the institutional groups are added together, 51.9 percent of the students took no such foreign language classes during their undergraduate studies. An even clearer indication of the low rate of exposure to foreign language education on our campuses is the fact that in every institutional group, the overwhelming proportion of students who do take skill oriented language courses take one year or less of language training. In the university group, 69.4 percent of the students either take no such language training while at the university, or only a lower level course; this is true of 85.7 percent of students in comprehensive institutions; 65.2 percent in baccalaureate institutions, 89.3 percent in two-year institutions, and 75.3 percent of the students in all institutional classes combined. For some students, these figures underrepresent their total exposure to foreign language instruction, since they may also be taking a second foreign language—our survey of 64 language department chairs indicated that in their opinion about 10 percent or less of the students do so—and some may enter college with enough foreign language training in high school and skip directly to literature courses, but the overall pattern holds true.

There is, of course, variation within the institutional groups, particularly among the baccalaureate institutions. In several of the highly selective liberal arts colleges of the Midwest more than 90 percent of the students take a skill oriented foreign language course, and well over half of them take an intermediate or upper level course. On the other hand, in a few colleges (generally those recently converted from two-year institutions) more than 80 percent of the students take no foreign language training and less than 10 percent take any course above the introductory level. Institutions within the other categories tend to be closer to the average, with the exception of a few liberal arts oriented universities whose students take language courses in the same fashion as the students in the baccalaureate institutions.

In general terms, however, the pattern indicated in table 3.11 describes the situation in most institutions of our site visit sample. Just as we noted with regard to study abroad, foreign language study at the collegiate level is primarily a liberal arts oriented phenomenon. It is very poorly represented in those institutions that have high proportion of students majoring in applied and preprofessional fields. With very few exceptions, language study is only lightly represented at the community college level. The same characteristics that make the community college environment a difficult one in which to conduct successful study abroad programs—a part-time, occupationally oriented, already-employed student body in which ethnic and racial minorities and families in the lower socioeconomic classes are overrepresented—limit enrollments in foreign language classes.

The liberal arts orientation of foreign language learning is also indicated in the frequency of enrollments in elementary, intermediate, and advanced language courses by students graduating with various disciplinary majors.

Table 3.12 Mean Number of Language Courses Taken by 1986 Degree Recipients, by College Major and Institutional Type (continued)

Major	University	Comprehensive	Baccalaureate	Two-year
Social Sciences				
Anthropology	3.5	1.0	2.2	0.0
Economics	2.0	1.4	2.2	4.0
Geography	1.2	0.7	—	0.0
International relations	3.4	4.6	4.5	0.0
Political science	2.6	1.7	2.6	—
Psychology	2.1	1.2	1.9	0.7
Sociology	1.5	0.9	1.6	3.5
Other social sciences	1.3	2.0	4.0	—
Area Studies				
African studies	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Asian studies	9.0	1.5	6.1	0.0
European studies	0.0	3.7	5.0	0.0
Latin American studies	0.0	4.3	2.3	0.0
Middle East studies	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Black/Afro-American studies	1.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
Chicano/Hispanic studies	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0
Other area studies	0.0	1.5	4.5	0.0
Natural Sciences				
Biological sciences	1.9	1.1	2.0	2.0
Physical sciences	2.1	1.1	2.1	—
Applied and Professional Fields				
Agriculture	1.1	0.6	—	0.3
Business	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.7
Communications	1.7	1.8	0.8	0.3
Computer science	1.1	0.8	1.0	0.3
Education	1.6	0.5	0.8	0.7
Engineering	0.3	1.1	0.0	0.4
Health professions	0.2	0.4	1.2	0.3
Library science	1.5	0.7	3.3	1.5
Other applied and professional fields	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.4
All Fields	**1.5**	**1.1**	**1.9**	**0.6**

Source: Transcript analysis.

— No language courses recorded on transcripts.

Table 3.12, based upon our analysis of the transcripts of graduates, indicates the mean number of such language courses taken by undergraduate students in each major in each institutional type.

The picture that emerges is quite clear. Collegiate foreign language instruction touches most students only very slightly, if at all. Fitting foreign language instruction into the more occupationally oriented community colleges and comprehensive institutions is especially difficult. No matter what our aspirations for universal foreign language learning, even in the other institutional types, a very large proportion of students receive no foreign language instruction. Even among those who do, the average student takes only between one and two skill oriented language courses while in college.

In examining differences in on-campus foreign language learning among the various majors, we found the very same pattern we uncovered in study abroad. As in the rest of international studies, the study of foreign languages is predominantly taken by humanities and social science majors, and even there students in some majors take surprisingly little foreign language training. For example, outside of students in baccalaureate institutions, those majoring in the visual and performing arts and geography majors have relatively little exposure to foreign language training. Sociology majors tend to be parochial in their foreign language education, as do those majoring in the applied and professional disciplines. It is especially regrettable that as the practice of their discipline is becoming increasingly international in focus, those in engineering and in the sciences typically receive little or no collegiate foreign language instruction. This is a clear example of the lack of correspondence between national need and educational practice. Especially troublesome is the low exposure of education majors to foreign language education. Nothing is more likely to perpetuate our unfortunate national devotion to monolingualism than perpetuating the tradition of a largely monolingual teaching profession, one unlikely to convey to students more of a desire to take foreign languages than the teachers themselves had.

Changing the Pattern

So far we have treated the information on total enrollments, enrollment gradients, and difference in exposure to foreign language instruction as scorekeeping problems, arguing for a more refined system of record keeping at both the institutional and national level, but the implications of these data are even more profound. They raise fundamental issues of foreign language educational policy. The basic questions to be addressed in institutional and national policy are: does the current, relatively low level of foreign language training meeting national needs, and can and should it be

changed? Planning for change in the system must await an answer to these fundamental questions.

Length of language study. First, what do the data show? As we indicated above, one of the most striking features of foreign language instruction at the undergraduate level is the relatively low percentage of students who take any language classes at all, and of those who do take college level language courses, the low proportion who proceed beyond the elementary or intermediate level. In many institutions, where there is a foreign language requirement at all, only one semester or one year of study is required for graduation. More generally, the drop-off in enrollments between the first and second semester is precipitous, ranging between one-third and one-half, and between the first and second year a decline of almost 80 percent in the major languages takes place, with an equivalent drop between the second and the third year. What the implications of this are for institutional policy depend upon what the purpose of foreign language training is.

Foreign language study for general education. If the primary purpose of collegiate foreign language study is to contribute to a student's general education—for instance, if the goal is the reduction of ethnocentrism and the provision of an understanding of another culture—the research question is, to what extent is this goal built into elementary language teaching and to what extent is this goal achieved? The evidence on this point is rather slim. David Wilkins, assigned by the Council of Europe to review all of the relevant literature, noted that "Virtually no empirical research into the cognitive, conceptual and affective/attitudinal effects of foreign language learning has ever been done."[8] This statement is a bit sweeping. There are many positive statements[9] in the American literature but there have been only a few empirical studies and their conclusions are unclear. Some American evidence suggests that the study of foreign languages improves SAT's, and the bilingual education literature has a fair amount of evidence on the psychological benefits of bilingualism. But the only major study on the benefits of foreign language study to cross-cultural understanding is somewhat less positive. The Educational Testing Service (ETS) conducted a major national survey of college students' knowledge of international affairs, their attitudes towards other nations, and what they judged to be good and bad. As part of that survey ETS also measured students' foreign language competency and determined the interrelationship among these variables. Two authors of the survey report, Thomas Barrows and John Clark, concluded: "Although a substantial correlation between language and knowledge could not establish causality, the absence of such a relationship rules out the hypothesized role of language as a 'source' of global understanding."[10] Both Barrows and Clark, and Wilkins express some doubt that low levels of language competency can have much effect; however, Barrows and Clark hypothesized the existence of "a 'threshold' level of language proficiency, below which there would be essentially no relationship between proficiency and world knowledge, but above which (effectively masked by the total data) relatively substantial effects might be present."[11]

Many language teachers insist that the kind of global information and the set of attitudes which are measured in the ETS survey are not what foreign language courses are supposed to produce. At the very least, however, the ETS data indicate that it is necessary to specify a little more clearly just what the secondary benefits of foreign language learning are. And to follow the Barrows and Clark argument, what is the minimum amount of time needed for these benefits to set in? Or to ask the question more generally, how can we guarantee in each semester of language instruction the greatest return in terms of perceptual and attitudinal growth? We need to maximize the impact of each segment of foreign language instruction on producing transnational understanding and knowledge. How long that training must be to accomplish that purpose becomes the second question.

We know of no research specifically dedicated to this issue although, in an indirect way, it is beginning to be addressed in discussions now taking place concerning the proper role of culture in foreign language instruction. It is indirect because these discussions do not quite address the question of the extent to which foreign language learning produces greater intercultural knowledge and awareness. They tend to view a knowledge of another culture as a necessary component in the development of a foreign language skill;[12] they do not entertain the general education argument that the development of transcultural empathy is a by-product of foreign language learning. The research necessary to establish a calculus for measuring the amount of international understanding derived from different amounts and styles of foreign language instruction remains to be done.

The contribution of limited amounts of foreign lan-

guage learning to a student's general education is particularly relevant for community colleges and other institutions where the single-semester language course is often found, and in comprehensive institutions where the one-year language course is very common.

Determining the general educational benefits of collegiate foreign language instruction becomes even more pressing when we note that a very substantial portion of incoming students have had some exposure to language learning in secondary and primary school. What is the educational value added of foreign language instruction at the college level for students who have already had two years or more of foreign language study in high school? The ACE/UCLA annual reports on the characteristics of a national sample of college and university freshmen indicate that in 1983, 64.2 percent of all students had studied at least two years of a foreign language before their arrival.[13] By 1987, the figure had increased to 73.4 percent.[14] In universities, by 1987 the proportion of freshmen who had taken at least two years of high school foreign language instruction had risen to 88.6 percent from 79.6 percent four years earlier. Even in two-year institutions, 58 percent of entering freshmen had studied a foreign language for two years. Yet we found very few colleges reporting any adjustment of their own language teaching program or language requirements to reflect the greater precollegiate language training of incoming students. A very few institutions have altered their language requirements to take cognizance of these changed circumstances. For instance, as noted earlier, Swarthmore's solution to the problem of language requirements was to push the responsibility for skill oriented foreign language education back on the high schools. No other institutions in our sample seemed to take this approach. Nor was Swarthmore's decision based upon the presumed general education benefits of foreign language learning.

A careful review of the general education benefits of college level foreign language instruction when added to high school instruction would be quite useful, if only to target more carefully the content and purposes of that instruction.

Foreign language study as skill development. If one values foreign language study not so much for its presumed by-product of promoting transcultural understanding and knowledge, but for the creation of a specific skill—the ability to comprehend and use a particular foreign language—then the limited length of time a language is studied and its relationship to previous secondary or primary school education becomes a different issue. Now the steepness of the drop-off between the first and the second semester in lower level courses, and between the lower and intermediate level courses is of great concern. It raises questions about how much skill can be developed realistically in the very limited time normally allocated to foreign language study.

Performance norms keyed to length of study. One of our great national needs is the establishment of some realistic norms of how much foreign language skill acquisition can take place with different amounts of instruction, in different kinds of languages, in different learning situations. Rough standards of the kind we seek have been developed for full-time, intensive instruction in government language-teaching programs. For instance, the Foreign Service Institute estimates that it takes their average student 240 hours within eight weeks of classroom time studying French, German, or Spanish to reach what they refer to as a 1 to 1+ level speaking proficiency, that is, what they call elementary proficiency. They define this level as "able to satisfy minimum courtesy requirements and maintain very simple face-to-face conversations on familiar topics." It is possible that college students will take less—or more—time, but if one assumes five hours a week of language classes as typical of college level language instruction, it should take college students about a year and a half—3.2 semesters—to take this many hours of instruction. If the classes meet only three hours a week, it would take two and a half years—5.3 semesters. And this is for the "easy" languages. For languages that are least like our own, such as Japanese, Chinese, and Arabic, twice that amount of time is required—and this is for spoken competency only. With their difficult orthographies, learning to read these languages significantly adds to the hours required. The government estimates, while approximate and developed for other learning situations, are undoubtedly proportionally realistic for college instruction as well.

It is against such a standard of competency that the relative contribution of various amounts of study time should be judged. If collegiate language courses provide the only instruction in a particular language many students get, then certainly a semester (and perhaps even a year, which is the typical length of language study for college students) produces a competency well below the elementary level as defined by the Foreign Service Institute. This limited amount of training may prepare a student for later language learning, or provide general metalinguistic language-learning skills,[15] but the ability to function in the language is quite limited and likely to

fade very quickly if not used.

Language teachers know this. It is why some teachers press for multi-year language requirements of the kind that are routine in many European countries. They know that student expectations of the amount of skill to be acquired in brief periods of time are often unrealistically high. They know that students often feel that a great deal of progress has been made in the first months of foreign language learning, but that settling in for the hard work of cumulative acquisition in the second and third years is more demanding and less productive of apparent progress. They know that many students adopt two contradictory beliefs: (1) that one can develop a usable foreign language skill in a few months of limited classroom study; and (2) that Americans can never really become fluent in speaking a foreign language. It is this second belief that nurtures the common experience of American students who find themselves in Europe with four or five years of high school and college French or Spanish unable to start, let alone carry on, a conversation in those languages. It is because of the first belief that the truly radical innovations in American foreign language teaching tend to concentrate heavily on the first six months of instruction, with less attention to higher levels of skills. We tend to cater to the myth of the quick fix.

From the perspective, then, of giving students meaningful foreign language skills, and given our tradition of student-determined course selection, several of the key agenda items for the development of language instruction at the college level emerge. How can we motivate students to continue language study to the point where they can attain a practical level of skill? What are the most suitable teaching and learning strategies to make real skill acquisition possible? And in particular, what needs to be done at the crucial intermediate and advanced levels of instruction so that more students obtain genuinely usable language skills?

An individual-specific, longitudinal perspective. If we add two years of high school language instruction to a year or two of college level instruction, there probably is enough time to get students to a noticeable level of foreign language proficiency, even using the government's estimates of the amount of classroom time required. And if one adds other language learning opportunities, such as a stint in a study abroad program or informal language practice in facilities such as foreign language tables in dining halls or residential language houses, the amount of time some students invest in learning a foreign language can be very substantial. The trouble is that all of the bits and pieces of language learning are rarely put together. What is needed is a method of making cumulative the language learning experiences of individual learners.

Discontinuities in the system. Just counting how many semesters or years a student has devoted to language study is not enough, particularly when the calculation is done separately for each educational level. For instance, as part of this survey we made a concerted effort to link high school records with college level records in order to determine how many foreign language courses different kinds of students took at the various educational levels in several states. No state or local system was able to provide this information. Some of the national studies of cohorts of individuals moving through the system do give a limited retrospective view of language courses taken by high school students,[16] and a few college level cohort studies indicate the language course-taking patterns of college undergraduates.[17] But a system for tracking student language-learning experience across educational levels is nonexistent.

Table 3.13 Percentage of a Cohort of High School Students Who Took the Next Higher Level Courses after Passing the Previous Level

Language	Percentage of Students Who Took Level 2 after Passing Level 1	Took Level 3 after Passing Level 2	Took Level 4 after Passing Level 3
French	59.2%	27.5%	11.6%
German	64.2	34.0	17.4
Latin	49.1	16.1	5.3
Spanish	58.6	21.1	6.9

Source: William B. Fetters and Jeffrey A. Owens, *High School and Beyond: Tabulation. Foreign Language Course Taking by 1980 High School Sophomores Who Graduated in 1982* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1984).

However, even in the absence of conclusive evidence, the data that are available indicate a startling lack of continuity in the national system of language instruction. For instance, the pattern of steep enrollment gradients, indicating a lack of student persistence in studying a foreign language, appears at the high school level as well as at the college level. Table 3.13 indicates the continuation rates of students between each level of foreign language instruction in high school. It takes a cohort of students successfully completing the first year of foreign language instruction and indicates the percentage of that cohort that was enrolled in each subse-

quent level.

It is clear that the same kind of attrition of student interest in foreign language study takes place at the high school level as it does at the college level. Like college students, most high school students just do not get enough foreign language training to matter much.

Aside from these language course drop-out rates, there is another kind of discontinuity that is equally damaging for long-term foreign language acquisition. The available data do not make clear in which grades high school language instruction usually takes place. However, interviews with both collegiate language department chairs and language administrators at the precollegiate level indicated that, all too often, foreign language instruction at the high school level was given in the ninth and tenth grades, making a two-year gap between high school and college level instruction. This amount of lapsed time and the low level of skill the student has initially achieved is almost a guarantee of language skill attrition.

This typical interruption in the sequence of foreign language instruction may account for the lack of enthusiasm for high school preparation we found among many college language department chairs: of the 64 we surveyed, 14 said that high school language training was practically nonexistent as far as their students were concerned; 21 said it was poor; 27 said it was fair; and only 2 said that it was good. At the same time, many language teachers we met from good high schools lamented the fact that their best students often reported that what they had accomplished in high school, particularly the attainment of speaking skills, was not well utilized at the college level.

The lack of integration between the mushrooming foreign language programs at the elementary school level and the secondary school level is even greater. Planning for carry-over into high school of foreign language skills learned in elementary school is very limited indeed.

In our interviews we found another curious lack of integration. Most post-secondary institutions do provide entering freshmen with the option of taking an examination to assess their foreign language skills at the time of matriculation from high school. What is curious is that the rationale for administering entry level tests is rarely to measure a student's foreign language competency for the purpose of building on it and helping him or her go on to higher levels, or to encourage the student to use his or her language skills in college—it is to excuse the student from all or part of the language requirement. More than one chairperson told us that the intent of these exams was to block students who were seeking an easy "A" through repeating language training they had had in high school. If previous training were discovered, the student would immediately be transferred into a class in another foreign language. It was much less common for us to find situations in which high school language learning was looked on as something to build upon, except perhaps to spot a potential major.

The lack of cumulativeness of foreign language learning within and between levels of the educational system constitutes a waste of both the students' and the faculty's time and resources. A shift from a level- and course-specific way of viewing foreign language instruction to one that is individual-specific and cumulative is needed. Fortunately, there are formal and information organizations in place to work on such issues. One of the most successful and most widespread is the Academic Alliance System, developed by Connecticut College president Claire Gaudiani, that provides for continuous consultation between high school and college language teachers on matters of common concern. Trans-school planning and the development of a system of tracking the cumulative language-skill acquisition of individual students is a natural agenda for this and similar groups.

In addition, within colleges and universities, foreign language planning ought to build upon the prior training that students bring to the campus.

High achievement learners. The focus in the American foreign language educational system of providing as many people as possible with some language training has meant that almost no attention has been paid to providing a high level of skill to those students who are both good language learners and for various reasons motivated to high achievement. To break out of the current system that is, to use a cliche, "a mile wide and an inch deep," we need to take the longitudinal perspective which we urged in the previous section.

In particular, in foreign language education we need to start planning for the college level—and for that matter graduate school—beginning at least at the high school level. There are increasing numbers of quite good language instructional programs in our high schools. Moreover, there are now, as there always have been,

frequent conjunctions of a gifted teacher and a gifted learner. More generally, many good students do persevere with foreign language learning. The semester to semester retention rate in foreign language classes for high school students is as much as 50 percent higher for students who get A's and B's in foreign language classes than it is for enrollees in general.[18] The current structure of the language education system at the high school level, partitioned as it is into semesters and years, and confined as it tends to be to the lower levels of instruction, has little room for nurturing cumulative skills to a high level of competency for those students who can and want to acquire it.

We have no system of identifying effective learners early in their schooling; of giving them special opportunities to improve their skills; of assuring them of continuity and cumulativeness in their language learning; of helping them to develop their skills to the highest possible level both in the United States and abroad; and above all, no way of letting them utilize those skills in courses and activities related to their substantive interests in or out of their major. While there may be special sections of courses for good language learners in skill oriented language courses, there is no sequential "track" that moves good language learners ahead more rapidly and more completely than the general group of students.

A national system that wants to build genuinely high level competency in some students should have a way to identify good students in high school, both by their aptitude and by their demonstrated accomplishments in class. These students should have in their own school a special honors track that recognizes and encourages the use of a foreign language. The very best students should compete to attend at the state level some equivalent to a "language study governor's school," which would be geared to their special accomplishments and needs. They could be sent to one of the several summer intensive programs at the college level that draw a national clientele. Travel fellowships could be provided for the summer, particularly the doldrums between high school and college, to give them an opportunity to hone their language skills to a higher level. For the present purpose, the important point is not just the establishment of these special summer schools and programs—many states already have them—but that they deliberately face toward and are integrated with both high school and college language training. It will not help if they become yet another discontinuity in a student's history of foreign language learning.

The advantage of such a system would be that it would raise the level of foreign language competencies of a significant set of students, but it would also present the colleges and universities with freshmen whose language skills could be expanded and built on. A foreign language competency could become an important component in the rest of their college education. Surely the true role of foreign languages at the college level lies beyond the mastery of foreign language skills per se. It is the access those language skills give to the particular knowledge and perspectives of other nations that is of most importance, for this information is directly applicable to the humanities, the social sciences, the nature sciences, and the professions—to all of the substantive realms of undergraduate education. Yet our undergraduate educational system is very rarely directed to this goal.

Given the administrative will, such a system would not be difficult to initiate at the secondary school level where centrally planned curricular change has a firm tradition. However, in most universities and many colleges, the institutional ability to implement centralized planning of course level content for foreign languages is usually quite limited. It should be possible, however, to introduce some options that could utilize the enhanced language skills such a supplemented high school system presented. It should be possible to create pathways in college that build upon high-level language skills other than the usual one now available—becoming a language major or minor, with a special emphasis on literature. Foreign language education and utilization has to become an institutionwide objective, just as the ability to write standard English is now.

As we noted at the outset, successfully accomplishing institutionwide initiatives in a college or university setting is a task for Sisyphus. Departmental and course autonomy win most of the battles. There are, however, three steps that can be taken to move ahead.

Expanded upper-level language courses. In taking advantage of higher foreign language competencies among incoming students, particularly those who may benefit from new "tracks" tailored to their special skills and interest, special attention should be paid to the development of truly advanced language training. We need a major research and development effort focused on providing high-level skills to selected students in the college setting. Prototypes for such courses already exist in advanced conversation or writing courses, but

they tend to be very lightly attended, and they focus on segmental skills. What is needed are courses that bring general skills to as high a level as possible. The experience gained in existing upper-level courses will be a good starting place. In addition, we need to draw upon the growing body of relevant knowledge in applied linguistics; the extensive experience other countries have had in taking students to a truly high level of skill in a wide variety of languages; our own experience in the government training centers and in cooperative university programs for advanced language study overseas; and the immense expertise we have developed on our campuses in teaching English to foreign students. It is time we considerably raised our goals and our expectations regarding college language learning.

Table 3.14 Language Study prior to Study Abroad Experience, by Country Visited and Level of Language Study

Study Abroad Country	Total Students	Level of Language Study Completed prior to Study Abroad: Elementary — Number of Students	Elementary — Percent	Intermediate — Number of Students	Intermediate — Percent	Advanced — Number of Students	Advanced — Percent	Any Language Study — Number of Students	Any Language Study — Percent
Europe									
France	152	101	66%	32	21%	—	—	133	88%
West Germany	69	42	61	8	12	5	7	55	80
Spain	71	49	69	7	10	1	1	57	80
Soviet Union	9	8	89	—	—	—	—	8	89
Other Europe	77	6	8	4	5	—	—	10	13
Latin America	23	6	26	7	30	—	—	13	57
Asia									
Japan	43	22	51	1	2	—	—	23	53
China and Taiwan	12	9	75	—	—	—	—	9	75
Other Asia	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Middle East	12	1	8	1	8	—	—	2	17
Africa	27	—	—	1	4	—	—	1	4
All countries	505	244	48	61	12	6	1	311	62

Source: Transcript analysis.

Note: Of the 311 students who went to a country in which a foreign language was spoken and who had had at least some language training prior to study abroad, 78 percent (244/311) took courses at the elementary level, 20 percent (61/311) at the intermediate level, and 2 percent (6/311) at the advanced level.

— No students or percentage.

Foreign language learning and study abroad. A very substantial portion of our study abroad programs is devoted to foreign language training. Out of the courses for which the students in our transcript sample received overseas credit 25 percent were skill oriented language courses, and 19 percent were literature courses. One of the most pressing research needs in international studies is a review of the content of such foreign language instruction programs abroad, and particularly what they contribute to the language competencies of students. There are very few surveys of what happens in such programs, or what value is added by study in a country where the language is spoken.[19] On the one hand, there is the assumption that students learn better in a language-rich environment and that there are many aspects of language learning that can only—or more efficiently—be learned in a country where the language is spoken. On the other hand, anecdotal evidence and the results of the few empirical studies give a much more mixed impression. In some cases, overseas training is reported to be not very different from training on the home campus. Students sit in classrooms utilizing the same text materials, sometimes with the same American professor supervising the instruction, and associating mainly with each other. The surrounding language-use environment is related in an unstructured way to the students' own acquisition strategies.

Individual students vary immensely in their ability to learn in an overseas environment. Few students are taught how to learn outside the classroom. Some students find ways to perform more fluently at the same level that they had achieved prior to coming abroad, but they do not move very far ahead in overall language command. Host countries sometimes set up separate language teaching enterprises which adjust their standards to what most American students are likely to learn. Other countries insist that language instruction be conducted by their regular language teaching faculty in regular classes at their universities with no accommodation of the language-learning styles of American students. These and many other caveats emerge from individual students' accounts of their experiences in learning a foreign language in study abroad programs, and from an unsystematic on-site review of a number of study abroad language programs in seven different countries. It would seem to be a high priority agenda item for the field to discover just what is actually learned by what kind of students in what kind of learning environment, and how this compares with what they

would have learned at home. There is, in fact, a research project underway to make just such a determination in the study of Russian and Japanese.[20]

For the present discussion concerning the attainment of advanced foreign language skills, two aspects of the current situation need to be emphasized. First, the point in the language-learning sequence when most students go abroad for foreign language instruction is too early for them to use their overseas experience most effectively. Second, except for foreign language majors, once students have upgraded their foreign language skills by study abroad there is little opportunity back on the home campus to utilize their skills in the rest of their education. Attrition begins as they step on the plane home.

At what stage in their language learning do most students go abroad? In table 3.14 we present an enumeration taken from the analysis of the 8,439 transcripts. It indicates whether undergraduates who studied abroad had taken any courses in the language of the country and to what level prior to their travel. Omitted from the table are students who went to English-speaking countries, so that only students placed in a foreign language environment are included. The data are presented only for the students at baccalaureate colleges because the samples for the larger universities do not reflect the characteristics of those who study abroad. Too few university students who study abroad are caught in the small cross-sectional sample. However, the general impression emerging from the data for these other institutional types is that for universities and comprehensive institutions, language training prior to study abroad is even more limited, and for the two-year institutions, almost nonexistent.

The conclusion to be drawn from this table is clear. Of the students who go to non-English speaking countries, 38 percent do so with no college level training in the language of the country they will visit. Among those who do have prior language training, the great majority (78 percent) have had only elementary level courses in the language; 20 percent have had intermediate level courses; and only 2 percent have had advanced courses. This pattern is reflected in the level of the language courses that students enroll in while they are abroad: our transcript analysis indicated that 53.9 percent of the language related courses students took overseas were at the elementary level; 28.7 percent were at the intermediate level; and only 17.4 percent were at the advanced level.

In short, the most common pattern is for students either to go abroad without foreign language training or to take their second year of language instruction abroad, often cramming the equivalent of a year's home coursework into summer study abroad. Indeed, satisfying the second year of a language requirement with a summer's work abroad is a common motivation for study abroad. The consequence of this pattern is that almost all study abroad programs outside the English-speaking countries become de facto foreign language programs. This is particularly true in countries such as the Soviet Union, or those in East Asia or the Middle East, where the ability to cope in the local language is essential to survival. Moreover, it is very difficult for students to take any substantive training at the overseas universities they attend because their level of language competence is too low. That is, unless the institution mounts substantive courses in English, or students attend one of the American institutions abroad that teach in English, their course work is essentially confined to learning a language. Even outside of the classroom, for many language learners the point where immersion in a foreign culture is most helpful is at a somewhat higher level than that which they achieved prior to their sojourn—the level at which the basics of production and listening skills have been mastered and the student is able to concentrate on the rich linguistic variety that only the host country can present. We are the only country in the world that sends students abroad for study with such a low level of foreign language competency.

One of the costs of this is that many students come back with middle level rather than high-level language skills, perpetuating the general pattern of limited foreign language competence among American undergraduates. This may be just as well. As we noted earlier, aside from foreign language majors, they will find very little in their future course work that will utilize these skills. Those with high-level skills whose competencies and interests might change the monolingual nature of undergraduate education have little or no outlet for their new linguistic ability. It would, however, make a major contribution to high-level skill acquisition if students knew that a language competency attained abroad could be utilized in courses relevant to their degree back home.

Foreign language utilization in substantive courses.

What is true of study abroad alumni is true more generally on the campus. Few developments would have greater promise for the enhancement of foreign

language skills among undergraduates than the provision of opportunities to utilize those skills in courses whose purpose is to teach a particular subject matter or discipline, not to improve language skills. It would be even more effective if those courses were not just area studies courses on the country, but substantive courses on topics relevant to the student's degree. If students learn in their undergraduate college that all that is worth learning is available in English, they are likely to continue with this misconception throughout their lives. There is almost nothing in their undergraduate education to convince them otherwise. Each year, in an absent-minded fashion, we visit our national linguistic blinders on yet another generation.

Breaking this cycle is not something that the language faculty can do on its own. It is also in the courses in other departments that the necessary change must take place. We must afford students the opportunity to sample writings in non-English tongues in a significant number of substantive courses.[4] Providing this opportunity is a responsibility of the institution as a whole and of the disciplinary departments in particular.

Today, the utilization of foreign language skills in substantive courses other than literature is very rare. This conclusion comes not only from our campus interviews, but also from several different kinds of data in our survey. First, in examining the 10,467 courses in our survey, the coders were instructed to mark any courses in which the catalog description indicated that foreign language readings would be used in the course. In the unlikely event that the course was to be taught in a foreign language, special note was to be made of it. The results were not surprising: outside of literature courses, we found no statement of prior language requirements for admission to a course.

Second, in an independent study done in 1981, I went through the catalogs of ten institutions looking for just such courses. At that time I found five such courses at the undergraduate level.[21] In 1987 we went back over the same catalogs and found a few, but not many, additional courses. They tended to occur mainly in connection with area studies majors, or in history departments. They included such courses as: "Paris in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," a course required of majors in French studies; "French Anthropological Studies in Africa"; "Jews in Arab Lands in Modern Times"; "Studies in Colonial Latin American History;" and "Indians of South America"—all area studies courses. In most cases, the catalog said that knowledge of the language was helpful but not essential. Things have changed some in eight years, but not much.

Third, in the current study, to assure that we were not missing courses requiring the use of foreign language materials that were not listed by the catalogs, we secured the lists of required reading for courses. We searched the lists for books or articles in foreign languages. Outside of readings for literature courses, none appeared. No doubt we have missed isolated examples of foreign language use in nonlanguage and literature courses, but it seems safe to say that in most institutions their occurrence is, to say the least, unusual.

The reasons for this situation are many, not the least of which is an essentially monolingual faculty. But even where some faculty members do have foreign language competency, what hampers the use of foreign language materials is the generally low level of students' language skills. When deliberate attempts are made to develop disciplinary courses with a foreign language component, as at Earlham College, a great deal of effort has to be invested in glossaries and other linguistic aids so that what was supposed to be the discovery of enriched meaning turns into a slow translation course. One of the limitations in the use of many of the new commu-

Table 3.15 Institutions Offering and Percentage of Students Taking Language Courses, by Language, Level of Offering, and Institutional Type, 1986

Language Level	University		Comprehensive		Baccalaureate		Two-year	
	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]
Hindi Urdu								
Any course	1	< 1			1	0.1		
Highest level								
Elementary					1	0.1		
Intermediate								
Advanced	1	< 1						
Persian								
Any course	2	0.1			1	< 1		
Highest level								
Elementary					1	< 1		
Intermediate	1	0.1						
Advanced	1	< 1						

nications devices which provide opportunities for live communication across national boundaries is that the students' language competencies are so low that they cannot really process the information that has been made available. The reception of news programs by satellite, which is increasingly available on more and more campuses, must be mediated by either simultaneous translation or closed-captioning. Most American students are just not up to drinking from the firehose of information that spurts out of those broadcasts, no matter how vivid, how visual, or how immediate the message. Most of them are still acquiring fundamental language skills when they should be taking in this information and these fresh perspectives.

It is clear that breaking this pattern will require the effort of many people from a number of disciplines—and hopefully schools. It is, after all, the sociologist or the economist, the microbiologist or the specialist on international finance, who is going to have to introduce foreign language materials into his or her course. This means investing in the upgrading of existing faculty competencies, or the introduction of foreign language competency among the desiderata in selecting new disciplinary appointees. It also means, as I have been arguing, establishing foreign language relevant tracks for students who, combining high school and college training, can and will become proficient in a foreign language. Our interviews indicate that these sorts of students exist, and with interesting combinations of skills: a combined microbiology and German major at a major Southern university; an engineering student back from a Peace Corps experience in Latin America; a sociology student who had spent a year registered in a Swedish university. Students also told us that the educational system, particularly in the sciences with their huge claim on a student's course load and the free-elective-consuming pre-med requirements, inhibits the pursuit of such interests. Institutions that are serious about upgrading their students' foreign language competencies are going to have to go against the pressure of departmental priorities. Individual students can rarely win in such a battle.

Table 3.15 **Institutions Offering and Percentage of Students Taking Language Courses, by Language, Level of Offering, and Institutional Type, 1986 (continued)**

Language Level	University		Comprehensive		Baccalaureate		Two-year	
	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]
Other Iranian								
Any course	1	<.1						
Highest level								
Elementary								
Intermediate	1	<.1						
Advanced								
Russian								
Any course	12	1.8	6	1.6	10	2.9	4	0.5
Highest level								
Elementary		0.8		0.4	3	1.6	3	0.5
Intermediate	3	0.6	2	0.6	1	0.8	1	
Advanced	9	0.5	4	0.5	6	0.6		
Polish								
Any course	4	0.1						
Highest level								
Elementary	2	<.1						
Intermediate	2	<.1						
Advanced								
Czech and Slovak								
Any course	2	<.1						
Highest level								
Elementary	1	<.1						
Intermediate								
Advanced	1							
Serbo-Croatian								
Any course	1	<.1	1		1	<.1		
Highest level								
Elementary								
Intermediate		<.1	1		1	<.1		
Advanced	1							
Bulgarian								
Any course	1							
Highest level								
Elementary	1							
Intermediate								
Advanced								
Ukranian								
Any course	1	<.1						
Highest level								
Elementary								
Intermediate								
Advanced	1	<.1						

Languages Taught and Taken

It will come as a surprise to no one that undergradu-

Table 3.15 Institutions Offering and Percentage of Students Taking Language Courses, by Language, Level of Offering, and Institutional Type, 1986 (continued)

Language Level	University		Comprehensive		Baccalaureate		Two-year	
	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]
Other Slavic								
Any course	1	0.1	1					
Highest level								
Elementary		*<.1*						
Intermediate								
Advanced	*1*	*<.1*	*1*					
French								
Any course	13	16.8	9	13.7	13	24.7	6	7.5
Highest level								
Elementary		*7.8*		*8.0*		*9.9*		*5.5*
Intermediate	*1*	*7.1*	*2*	*3.0*	*4*	*9.7*	*3*	*1.7*
Advanced	*12*	*1.9*	*7*	*2.5*	*9*	*5.2*	*3*	*0.3*
Spanish								
Any course	13	20.4	10	16.3	13	21.0	6	18.3
Highest level								
Elementary		*9.2*		*12.3*		*11.7*		*10.3*
Intermediate	*1*	*9.1*	*3*	*3.1*	*2*	*7.3*	*2*	*7.7*
Advanced	*12*	*2.1*	*7*	*0.9*	*11*	*2.1*	*4*	*0.3*
Italian								
Any course	11	2.4	5	2.4	8	2.0	5	1.3
Highest level								
Elementary	*2*	*1.7*	*1*	*1.9*	*3*	*1.2*	*1*	*0.8*
Intermediate	*5*	*0.6*	*1*	*0.2*	*4*	*0.7*	*2*	*0.5*
Advanced	*4*	*0.1*	*3*	*0.2*	*1*	*0.1*	*2*	
Portuguese								
Any course	9	0.6	1	0.2	3	0.4	1	
Highest level								
Elementary	*3*	*0.2*	*1*	*0.2*	*2*	*0.1*	*1*	
Intermediate	*3*	*0.3*			*1*	*0.4*		
Advanced	*3*	*<.1*						
German								
Any course	13	7.1	10	7.6	12	13.8	5	1.5
Highest level								
Elementary		*3.9*	*2*	*4.3*	*1*	*6.3*	*1*	*1.2*
Intermediate	*1*	*2.4*	*2*	*1.3*	*3*	*4.3*	*2*	*0.4*
Advanced	*12*	*0.7*	*6*	*2.0*	*8*	*3.2*	*2*	
Swedish								
Any course	4	0.2			2	0.4		
Highest level								
Elementary		*0.1*			*2*	*0.4*		
Intermediate	*2*	*0.1*						
Advanced	*2*							

ate foreign language instruction, like study abroad, is still heavily focused on Western European languages. The MLA's figures indicated that in 1986, 80 percent of total enrollments were in just three languages: Spanish, French, and German.[22] Looking to the future, the United States' expanding relations with many countries make it difficult to set forth a case for the continuation of so narrow a concentration of languages offered to our students. An overwhelming concentration on Western European languages still makes some sense within Europe, as those countries prepare themselves for the transition into a single market in 1992. It makes much less sense for the United States.

What is less often noted is that many institutions, particularly universities and baccalaureate colleges, have already broadened their language coverage. Russian now has 28 percent of the enrollment of German. Japanese enrollments have increased by 119 percent over the past ten years; 45 percent in the last three years, and are now only 10,000 lower than those in Russian. Indeed, the growth of Russian at the college level seems to have stagnated—although the new linkages with the Soviet Union that have come about as a result of *glasnost* may change this—and the high growth rate for Japanese indicates that it may soon pass Russian, and after than Italian, as a widely taught language.

Many of the major universities have been assisted in their development of substantial Russian and Japanese programs, as well as many of the other less commonly taught languages, by the establishment of federally funded, graduate level language and area studies centers. The least commonly taught languages—Tamil, Quechua, Ibo, Uzbek—are found only in such centers. Since most of these courses are also open to undergraduates, many universities now offer their students a very wide assortment of languages.[23] However, even with this immense variety of languages offered, most students tend to enroll only in the few commonly taught languages. It is a rare undergraduate that will take Malayalam, for instance, even though his institution offers it.

What is a little less frequently remarked upon is the spread of instruction in the non-Western European languages in other institutions, particularly in baccalaureate colleges. We do not have a full national inventory of foreign language offerings, but our survey does permit

us to give a limited cross-sectional view of the range of languages and levels thereof that the different types of institutions offer. In table 3.15 we give several different kinds of information on the dispersion of instruction in various languages: how widespread the offering of each language is among institutions of each type; how high a level of instruction in each language those institutions offer; what percentage of the student body takes instruction in each language in any course at all; and the percentage of students who continue each level. Information in the first column of each institutional set is taken from our analysis of college catalogs and registrars' enrollment figures. It indicates the number of institutions in each class that offered any course in a particular language, and those who offered a course up to a particular level—elementary, intermediate, and advanced. No course is included in this tabulation unless it either had an undergraduate enrollment in 1985-86 or appeared as a course taken at that institution by one or more graduates of that year. Information in the second column of each institutional set is drawn from the transcript analysis. It indicates the percentage of all students in each type of institution who took any course in a particular language, and those who took courses up to each level of instruction. Taking as an example the data on Russian, 12 universities out of 13 offer instruction in Russian, 3 of them to the intermediate level and 9 to the advanced level. In these institutions 1.8 percent of students take Russian; 0.8 percent took Russian only to the elementary level; 0.6 percent took it to the intermediate level; and 0.5 percent took it to the advanced level. In short, only 1.1 percent of the university student body took Russian to what might be called a minimally useful level, that is, the intermediate or advanced level. Looking across institutional types, while 10 out of 13 baccalaureate institutions in our sample offered Russian, only 2.9 percent of their students took Russian, the majority of them only to the elementary level.

In general, the data in this table reinforce what has been said earlier. The bulk of language instruction takes place in Spanish, French, and German. Only these languages reach a substantial portion of the student body, and only 44.3 percent of university undergraduates take any course in even these languages (37.6 percent in comprehensive and 59.5 percent in baccalaureate institutions). No other language even gets close to

Table 3.15 Institutions Offering and Percentage of Students Taking Language Courses, by Language, Level of Offering, and Institutional Type, 1986 (continued)

	University		Comprehensive		Baccalaureate		Two-year	
Language Level	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]
Dutch								
Any course	4		1	0.1	1	<.1		
Highest level								
Elementary	1							
Intermediate	2		1	0.1	1	<.1		
Advanced	1							
Norwegian								
Any course	2	0.1						
Highest level								
Elementary		<.1						
Intermediate	1							
Advanced	1	0.1						
Danish								
Any course	3	0.2			2	0.1		
Highest level								
Elementary	1	0.2			1	<.1		
Intermediate	1				1	<.1		
Advanced	1							
Yiddish								
Any course	2	<.1			2	1.2		
Highest level								
Elementary		<.1			1	<.1		
Intermediate	1				1	1.1		
Advanced	1							
Modern Greek								
Any course	6	0.1			7	0.9		
Highest level								
Elementary	2	<.1			3	0.5		
Intermediate	3	0.1			3	0.2		
Advanced	1				1	0.1		
Armenian								
Any course	6	0.2						
Highest level								
Elementary								
Intermediate	4	<.1						
Advanced	2	0.1						
Arabic								
Any course	5	0.5	2	0.1	4	0.3	1	
Highest level								
Elementary	1	0.5	1	0.1	3	0.2	1	
Intermediate	1				1	0.1		
Advanced	3	<.1	1					

enrolling five percent of the student body. Similarly, five percent or less of the students reach advanced levels even in the three commonly taught languages in any of the institutional categories. In the less commonly taught languages, the number of undergraduates taking advanced level instruction is minuscule. The small role played by foreign language instruction in the community colleges is also evident. Only 27.3 percent of their students take any course in Spanish, French, or German, and the level of training they get is uniformly low. With a few exceptions, other languages are not offered in the two-year institutions.

Allowing for the historical tendency to concentrate foreign language instruction in a few Western European languages, what is surprising is the number of liberal arts colleges that do offer courses in other languages. Half or more of the institutions offer Italian, Russian, Japanese, and Chinese. Where one of these languages is offered, institutions tend to teach at least two years of the language. In addition to these languages, at least one baccalaureate institution out of the 13 in our sample offers instruction in one or another of the following languages: Hindi/Urdu, Persian, Serbo-Croatian, Portuguese, Swedish, Dutch, Danish, Yiddish, modern greek, Arabic, Hebrew, Swahili, Yoruba, Thai/Lao, Korean. The majority of them also teach classical Greek and Latin.

It seems likely that the pressure on colleges to expand their language offerings outside of those commonly taught is going to increase, if only because of pressures from students who are going to be bringing some training in these languages to college with them from high school and in some cases elementary school. Expansion of instruction at these levels, while still a very small proportion of all language instruction, is well underway, in some cases with the specific encouragement of foundations or governments. For instance, the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation invested $2.8 million into the expansion of Chinese language instruction at the high school level in 90 school districts. The Ford Foundation invested $475,000 in a program to subsidize the education of graduate students in Russian studies who will then go on to teach Russian in high schools. A new federally funded program will provide for exchanges between a set of American high schools with their Russian counterparts, including sending students to

Table 3.15 Institutions Offering and Percentage of Students Taking Language Courses, by Language, Level of Offering, and Institutional Type, 1986 (continued)

Language Level	University		Comprehensive		Baccalaureate		Two-year	
	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]
Hebrew								
Any course	8	1.2	2	0.1	6	0.6	2	
Highest level								
Elementary	1	0.9	1	0.1	3	0.3	1	
Intermediate	5	0.3	1		2	0.2		
Advanced	2				1	0.1		
Swahili								
Any course	3	< 1	1		1	0.4		
Highest level								
Elementary	2	< 1	1		1	0.4		
Intermediate								
Advanced	1							
Yoruba								
Any course	1	0.3	1		2	0.1		
Highest level								
Elementary						< 1		
Intermediate	1	0.3			1	< 1		
Advanced			1		1	< 1		
Turkish								
Any course	2							
Highest level								
Elementary								
Intermediate								
Advanced	2							
Hungarian								
Any course	1							
Highest level								
Elementary	1							
Intermediate								
Advanced								
Finnish								
Any course	1	< 1						
Highest level								
Elementary								
Intermediate	1	< 1						
Advanced								
Mandarin Chinese								
Any course	10	1.2	4	0.7	9	1.4	2	0.5
Highest level								
Elementary		0.6	1	0.4	1	0.6		0.3
Intermediate	4	0.3		0.2	4	0.3	2	0.3
Advanced	6	0.3	3	0.2	4	0.5		

spend time at each other's institutions. Almost every state in the U.S. has drawn up plans for expanding its instruction in Japanese at the high school level. For example, Michigan now requires every school district to offer instruction in Japanese within the next few years. External pressures, both from students and the surrounding community, combined with the institution's own desire to adjust to the new global environment, are going to push more and more colleges and universities to introduce instruction in one or more of the languages spoken outside of Western Europe.

The expansion of course offerings to include non-Western languages raises in an extreme form all of the common problems of organizing foreign language instruction. First, there are problems of justifying the instruction of languages whose enrollment is likely to continue to be low. In public institutions, the calculus of FTE's presents a major restriction on such expansion. And just offering one course is never enough. To make a minimally stable program in a language, several levels of instruction must be offered. Then, to make the program worthwhile for students, some substantive courses—usually in literature and history—are usually called for, making a mini-area program. Then library resources must be acquired. Then facilities for students and faculty to go to the country where the language is spoken must be developed. And few programs are satisfied with just one instructor—if there is one today, tomorrow there will be two. In short, introducing a non-Western language is usually an expensive and expansive investment.

Second, there are problems of organization. Foreign language faculties tend to be organized into language-family specific departments. For instance, fitting Japanese into a Romance language department is almost guaranteed to make it an administrative stepchild. Such departments have their own priorities with which the newcomer must compete for resources, support staff, promotion and the like; and it tends to be a very uneven battle.

Third, the recruitment of qualified faculty can be difficult. To borrow an economist's term, language faculty are not fungible, that is, they cannot be moved from the teaching of one language to another. To tell a professor of German that he must now teach Japanese is absurd. Hence, for an insti-

Table 3.15 Institutions Offering and Percentage of Students Taking Language Courses, by Language, Level of Offering, and Institutional Type, 1986 (continued)

Language Level	University		Comprehensive		Baccalaureate		Two-year	
	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]
Other Chinese								
Any course	2	< 1			1	0.1		
Highest level								
Elementary					*1*	*0.1*		
Intermediate	*1*	*< 1*						
Advanced	*1*							
Thai-Lao-								
Any course	4				1	< 1		
Highest level								
Elementary	*2*							
Intermediate	*1*				*1*	*< 1*		
Advanced	*1*	*< 1*						
Japanese								
Any course	11	2.2	5	1.8	7	2.9	2	0.2
Highest level								
Elementary	*1*		*2*	*1.5*	*1*	*1.8*		*0.2*
Intermediate	*2*	*0.5*	*1*	*0.3*	*1*	*0.8*	*1*	
Advanced	*8*	*0.8*	*2*	*0.1*	*5*	*0.2*	*1*	
Korean								
Any course	3	0.1	2	< 1	3	0.1	1	
Highest level								
Elementary	*1*		*1*	*< 1*		*< 1*	*1*	
Intermediate	*1*	*0.1*	*1*		*1*	*< 1*		
Advanced	*1*				*2*			
Tamil								
Any course	1		1	< 1				
Highest level								
Elementary								
Intermediate								
Advanced	*1*		*1*	*< 1*				
Other Modern Language								
Any course	2	0.2	2	< 1	8	0.7		
Highest level								
Elementary			*1*	*< 1*	*7*	*0.6*		
Intermediate			*1*		*1*	*0.1*		
Advanced	*2*	*0.2*						
Classical Greek								
Any course	5	0.5	3	0.4	8	1.2	1	
Highest level								
Elementary	*1*	*0.1*	*1*	*0.2*	*4*	*1.2*	*1*	
Intermediate	*1*	*0.3*	*1*		*1*	*< 1*		
Advanced	*3*	*< 1*	*1*	*0.1*	*3*	*< 1*		

Table 3.15 Institutions Offering and Percentage of Students Taking Language Courses, by Language, Level of Offering, and Institutional Type, 1986 (continued)

Language Level	University		Comprehensive		Baccalaureate		Two-year	
	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]	Number of Institutions[a]	Percentage of Students[b]
Latin								
Any course	13	2.7	4	0.5	10	3.6	2	0.2
Highest level								
Elementary	*3*	*1.9*	*3*	*0.5*	*4*	*2.8*	*1*	*0.2*
Intermediate	*8*	*0.8*	*1*		*3*	*0.8*	*1*	
Advanced	*2*				*3*	*< 1*		

Sources: Catalog, course, and transcript analysis.

Notes: Advanced level includes graduate level courses and mixed graduate and undergraduate courses in addition to advanced undergraduate courses.

Cases that show an entry in the "Number of Institutions" column, but nothing in the "Percentage of Students" column indicate that there are courses offered at that instructional level, but no students in the transcript population took them.

Cases where there are entries in the elementary and/or intermediate levels in the "students" column, but none in the "institution" column indicate that the institutions offer elementary and intermediate courses in addition to courses at the advanced level where the institution is counted.

[a] The figures in the "Any course" row indicate the total number of institutions that offered any course in the language indicated in the 1985–86 academic year or graduated that year a student with a course in the language recorded on his/her transcript; on the three italicized rows below the "Any course" row, the figures show those institutions distributed by the highest course level offered.

[b] The figures in the "Any course" row show students who took any course in the language indicated as a percentage of all undergraduate students in our sample enrolled at the institutions offering any instruction in the language indicated. The course could have been taken at any time in the student's undergraduate career and at any institution—including study abroad. On the three italicized rows below the "Any course" row, the figures show that total percentage distributed by the highest level of course work taken by the student.

tution, offering a new language requires the addition of new staff. We encountered many institutions trying to find a solution of minimal expense and commitment to the demand for new staff: using a string of foreign visitors under, say, the Fulbright program to teach a language; employing the spouse of an expatriate faculty member for whom the language is a mother tongue; giving part-time employment to a foreign graduate student. However, such solutions almost guarantee that the program will not succeed. It will have shallow roots, and will encounter all of the problems inherent in using an untrained native speaker alone in a foreign language classroom—one who has no sense of how Americans learn a language—to teach a foreign language. The immense national shortage of qualified Japanese instructors in the face of the current explosive demand is threatening to lock institutions into staffing patterns that will be troublesome for a long time.

Another common solution to the need for new faculty is to try to share the costs of instruction with other institutions. Offering instruction in some of the less commonly taught languages is a characteristic feature of consortial arrangements.[24] There are several examples of such arrangements, such as Five Colleges, Inc., the five-college consortium in New England, where the institutions are close enough, the students are mobile enough, and the administrative superstructure tending to the shared enterprise is strong enough, so that the consortial solution works well. However, given the immense weekly time demands and the long-term student and faculty commitment required for foreign language instruction, successful management of consortial language instruction is often quite difficult to manage.

There are, in addition, various individualized instructional systems, including one maintained by the National Association of Self-Instruction Language Programs, that will provide instruction in a variety of less commonly taught languages. There is even a system based at Ohio State University that will service language learning through a telephone network. Further experiments are in progress to offer instruction via satellite, or through public educational television as is commonly done in Great Britain.

The basic problem is one of geographically concentrated teaching resources and geographically dispersed demand in the less commonly taught languages. Until our language instructional system can reduce its total dependence on classroom teaching in a face-to-face academic course setting, the addition of instruction in the non-European languages will have to be carried out within the framework of our existing colleges and universities like any other educational expansion. This will immensely limit its progress. the expansion of the less commonly taught languages is an opportunity to develop new and different systems for language instruction.

Intra-Institutional Development

So far, we have been approaching foreign language instruction from a national perspective, indicating what changes are called for on the basis of data aggregated to the national level. In the end, however, foreign language instruction is carried out on individual campuses, and if change is to take place, it must be implemented there. Accordingly, it is useful to supplement the overall national perspective with a view of what language teachers

and administrators on individual campuses see as their greatest needs. We do, in fact, have a great deal of data on this. We interviewed and/or had extensive questionnaires completed by 64 language department chairpersons. In each case, we asked what changes they believed would most advance the field. In addition, we were able to examine the funding proposals of 19 liberal arts colleges that received substantial grants from the Andrew Mellon Foundation to improve their language programs, with special reference to the less commonly taught languages.

There is a surprising uniformity in the felt needs of the foreign language field. We list elements of the common wish list below, and then suggest each element's implications with regard to national policy.

Faculty augmentation. There is an almost universal feeling among foreign language faculty that they are understaffed for the tasks that face them. It is true that almost every academic department shares this feeling to some extent, but it seems particularly strong in the language departments. This is especially true given the new demands on faculty to teach intensive courses, invest time outside of class in supplemental instructional activities, introduce new technologies which almost always call for reduction in class size and consequently increase demands on teachers' time, participate in extradepartmental activities such as the management of study abroad or share courses, introduce nationally normed oral proficiency tests, and add to the less commonly taught languages. Where the departments are small, as in many liberal arts colleges, all of these demands descend on a handful of people.

Accordingly, the most frequently expressed need was for more staff, a demand few college and university administrators were prepared to meet. One solution is to put more of the responsibility of language learning on the student through a greater availability of non-classroom, individualized learning materials. At the national level, the problem of limited numbers of teachers on individual campuses and the need to make major transformations in college foreign language teaching make it urgent that more collective solutions be found. They include institutions agreeing to share responsibility for teaching various languages and levels of instruction (a number of liberal arts colleges included in their Mellon proposals requests for funding to make such targeted consortial arrangements work better). They include sending students to national level summer intensive language teaching centers, or to carefully targeted overseas language training centers.

Another possible solution is the establishment of language-training institutes somewhat separate from the language departments, which will specifically focus on the lower levels of language instruction, staffed by *sprachmeisters* with less than full faculty status whose sole job is to teach elementary language skills. We found several universities beginning to experiment with such structures, and a number of administrators interested in the notion. More common on the liberal arts campus was the designation of a skilled language instruction coordinator who would coordinate basic skill instruction across languages.

One of the more innovative ideas was suggested independently by the faculty at several liberal arts colleges. They would like to see a nationally funded program under which graduate language majors would intern for a year in a liberal arts college language department. It would both give the colleges more flexibility in staff assignments and provide useful teaching experience for future language specialists in a teaching environment that universities cannot provide. In short, many different initiatives need to be explored so that the upgrading of foreign language training on our campuses does not depend solely upon an increase in the number of faculty. Such expansion on individual campuses is obviously needed, but it is clearly not enough.

A second theme in faculty augmentation was a need to add or train faculty who will be expert in the growing body of knowledge on the technology of foreign language pedagogy. Many departments are already taking steps in this direction. We found a number of departments indicating that for the first time they had sought candidates with such specific pedagogical expertise, and that they had even modified their tenure-screening process to include the preparation of innovative teaching materials or research on effective teaching strategies as legitimate criteria for promotion. We believe this to be an extremely important development that should be strongly supported. Aside from hiring new staff, teachers wanted opportunities for upgrading their own skills through released time for preparation of materials utilizing new technologies, funds to participate in workshops, or fellowship support for external study.

A final theme in faculty augmentation is the need for foreign language faculty to constantly refresh their own language competencies by means of professional sojourns in countries where the language is spoken. This can be done rather readily by Spanish teachers in the Southwest who can easily make a short trip to Mexico, and with a little more difficulty by teachers of the

Western European languages who can often arrange summer travel to Europe. But such irregular reinforcing of foreign language competence is not enough. What is needed is a fellowship program for travel abroad whose primary purpose is the regular refreshing of teachers' language skills.

Curricular development. We found that most language teachers both depend on and, in one way or another, are unhappy with the textbooks to which their instruction is bound. In the commonly taught languages, teachers found the flood of commercially produced materials overwhelming, and would like to see some system whereby the relative effectiveness of these textbooks in various instructional settings could be judged by somebody other than the publisher and the individual language teacher. In the less commonly taught languages, the necessary materials were either nonexistent or they were hard to come by and to evaluate. We found in many places that teachers are constantly creating bits and pieces of new teaching materials to supplement what is generally available in published form. We also found a general wish to share some of these materials with others and to benefit from the innovations made elsewhere. In addition, several institutions were seeking help from authoring systems that would bring expertise in curricular and materials design to the language teacher. This need was felt especially strongly in the less commonly taught languages, where even the most fundamental teaching materials were being created from scratch by many different teachers. It is obviously in the national, as well as the individual teacher's, interest to have a set of templates for effective materials productions so that the same wheel does not have to be invented in a thousand classrooms. In addition to commercial textbook publishing, some mechanism is needed to allow innovations to be available more widely and to make them cumulative in their effectiveness. This now happens in computer programming through bulletin board systems. An equivalent for foreign language teaching is sorely needed. At another level of permanence, some of the capabilities of desktop publishing should be tied to a wide distribution system that would allow the immense amount of creative energy now being invested in piecemeal advances in foreign language instruction to benefit a wider audience.

High tech communication systems. A special aspect of materials need is the almost universal desire of language teachers to introduce authentic materials (i.e., written, film, videotape, and live television materials) into the instructional process. The faculty in almost every institution recognize that our immensely improved capacity to bring directly into the classroom other languages as they are currently being used is of potentially great importance to foreign language instruction. Students used to have to wait for foreign travel or study abroad to experience language use in its proper cultural context. Now it is possible to introduce a perception of the native use of foreign languages directly into the classroom.

On the wish list of most language departments is the purchase of high technology communications equipment. While there is a strong feeling among language teachers that there is an immense potential in the new communications systems to benefit language instruction, mixed with this hope is a feeling of caution as they remember that past high tech innovations have not been especially useful for language teaching.

From the individual institution's standpoint, what is needed are funds to purchase high-quality, low-cost equipment of demonstrated effectiveness, and the development of equipment whose design is not just driven by the capabilities of the particular machine but by what is most supportive of pedagogical practice. The development of software and supporting materials so that the equipment is maximally useful for individual teachers and learners is a high-priority item on the national agenda. It would not seem to be a good national strategy for every institution—or teacher—to develop separately such equipment and support materials. This is surely a domain for centralized or coordinated activity. One college president identified a very specific need that could be centrally met: the use of authentic materials such as live television broadcasts pulled in by satellite dishes requires some supplemental annotating to make them useful, indeed usable, in most college classrooms. To carry this out separately on each campus would be inefficient; a centralized service to tailor these materials for classroom use is an ideal candidate for collective action, and might be partially supported by subscriptions from institutions and individuals.

Finally, in terms of curricular development, a number of interviewees and almost all of the Mellon grant applicants stressed the need to develop substantive courses other than literature in which foreign language use will take place. Since most foreign language departments lie in the humanities it is natural for faculty members to think of "civilization" or other high culture courses as the natural vehicle for this. Others expressed the need to develop service courses for the applied and professional disciplines, particularly business#and in

Hawaii, hotel management. A few institutions talked of surrounding their language instruction with a cluster of area courses to fully absorb the students' attention. Far fewer institutions proposed to introduce foreign language use into other kinds of substantive courses.

Students. Most of the needs expressed by language departments had to do with faculty and curricular development. Student needs entered the wish list only occasionally, and then primarily in terms of increased financial aid (particularly for majors) and expanded opportunity for study abroad. It is curious how rarely academic development efforts are directed toward students, except indirectly through faculty enrichment or curricular change.

Need for a National Program

What is clearly needed for collegiate level foreign language teaching is a major national effort dedicated to introducing major change and upgrading the system. The well-funded national campaign dedicated to the transformation of instruction in mathematics and science must be duplicated in foreign language instruction. When the upgrading of an entire field is involved, collective effort and resources are needed to augment what institutions and individuals can do on their own.

It is a curious fact that almost none of the federal or state funds expended on the improvement of foreign language instruction has been spent at the undergraduate level. There is nowhere to go for the resources needed to upgrade the nongovernmental teaching system. Federal expenditures for foreign language instruction are spent almost entirely on inhouse establishments that teach only government employees. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on foreign language training within the government and on the research and development activities to support that training. Most of the funds for the development and utilization of high technology in language teaching are spent within the Department of Defense and the intelligence agencies, and reach the rest of the population only indirectly, if at all. Almost no funds are expended on extragovernmental foreign language instruction. The only federal funds available for the development of language instruction in the colleges and universities are occasional and very small grants under HEA Title VI or through the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Even the money in the 1984 math and science bill,[25] part of which was earmarked for the development of foreign language instruction, was not spent on the improvement of college level foreign language instruction. While the universities and colleges were the grantees under what was called the Secretary's Discretionary fund, the expenditures were to be dedicated to the improvement of instruction at the secondary and primary levels. And virtually all of the recent investment in improvement of foreign language instruction at the state level has also been for elementary and high schools.

It is high time that the nation invested the necessary private and public resources needed to advance foreign language instruction at the collegiate level. It desperately needs changing and many in and out of the field are ready to lead that change. The foregoing discussion points to some of the high priority elements on the national agenda.

Notes

1 See Peter C. Patrikis, "Reports and Reforms: Where are the Foreign Languages?" *ADFL Bulletin* 20 (September 1988): 14-19.

2 Richard I. Brod, "Foreign Language Enrollments in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1986," *ADFL Bulletin* 19 (January 1988): 39-44, and Patricia Dondonoli, "Report on Foreign Language Enrollment in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1985," *Foreign Language Annals* 20 (October 1987): 457-70.

3 It would have been instructive, but for the purposes of this survey overly time consuming, to have tabulated the data by institutional type and language for each of the states and to have correlated institutional characteristics with the direction and rate of change in particular languages.

4 Included in our site visit sample is Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology which, for the purposes of this report, we have categorized as a "comprehensive" institution. The U.S. Department of Education categorizes it as a "specialized" institution.

5 A bachelor's degree for four-year institutions; an associate's degree for two-year institutions.

6 "CEP Report on Foreign Languages, May 1982" (Swarthmore, PA: Department of Modern Languages, Swarthmore College, 1982, Photocopy), 6.

7 Alexander Astin et al., *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1986* (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, 1986), 50; and Alexander Astin et al., *The American*

Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1985 (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, 1985), 46.

8 David Wilkins, *The Educational Value of Foreign Language Learning* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Council for Cultural Cooperation, 1987), 31.

9 For one of the many positive statements see Jean A. Perkins, "The Value of Foreign Language Study" (Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, San Francisco, 27-30 December 1987).

10 Thomas S. Barrows et al., *College Students' Knowledge and Beliefs: A Survey of Global Understanding* (New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1981), 128.

11 Ibid.

12 Cultural competency was included as an unspecified dimension in early measures of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages' Interagency Language Roundtable language proficiency levels. Cultural awareness is included in the language competencies of entering freshmen as specified by the academic senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of california, respectively. The general issue is discussed at length in Claire J. Kramsch, *New Directions in the Teaching of Language and Culture*, NFLC Occasional Papers (Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center at The Johns Hopkins University, 1989).

13 Alexander Astin et al., *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1983* (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, 1983), 43.

14 Alexander Astin et al., *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1983* (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, 1983), 47.

15 Empirical evidence does not substantiate the proposition that learning about languages in general assists or for that matter hinders the learning of a particular language.

16 See William B. Fetters and Jeffrey A. Owings, *High School and Beyond: Tabulation: Foreign Language Course Taking by 1980 High School Sophomores who Graduated in 1982* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, 1984).

17 These college level cohort tabulations will soon be available from the National Center for Education Statistics, although their coding of language related data is too gross for careful analysis.

18 Fetters and Owings, *High School and Beyond*, table 8.

19 Some insight into this issue may be obtained from Robert M. De Keyser, "From Learning to Acquisition?: Foreign Language Development in a U.S. Classroom and During a Semester Abroad" (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1986), and A. Ronald Walton, "CIEE China Consortium Programs Language Curriculum Review Trip, March 10-19, 1987: Report and Recommendations" (New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1987, Photocopy).

20 The American Council of Teachers of Russian, in cooperation with the National Foreign Language Center, is analyzing a voluminous body of data on student learner characteristics, their stateside preparation, their experience in programs in Leningrad, and their performance in language learning to address just such issues.

21 Richard D. Lambert, "Language Learning and Language Utilization," *ADFL Bulletin* 13 (September 1981): 8-13.

22 411,293 for Spanish; 275,328 for French; and 121,022 for German out of a total enrollment of 1,003,234 as reported in Brod, "Foreign Language Enrollments."

23 For recent tabulations of total enrollments in these languages see Brod, "Foreign Language Enrollments," tables 4 and 6. For a list of institutions teaching these languages see Richard D. Lambert et al., *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies* (Washington, DC: Association of American Universities, 1984), appendix D.

24 Of the four-year institutions in the national Higher Education Panel sample who were members of international studies consortia, 44 percent indicated that they use those arrangements to disperse the cost of providing language instruction.

25 The basic legislation providing this support is the Education for Economic Security Act, P.L. 98-377, Title II, sec. 212 (c,d)(1984). Directing these funds to the needs of pre-college language teaching occurred in the rules and regulations for grant applications. See, for instance, *Application for Grants Under the Education for Economic Security Act: Critical Foreign Languages Program*, CFDA no. 84.168F (Washington, DC: Secretary's Discretionary Fund, U.S. Department of Education, 1988).